The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v.33

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

Ecclesiastical Review.

JANUARY TO JULY, 1892.

VOL. XXXIII.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXIII.

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

Early Confidence the Key to Social Purity—By Rev. John Napleton 1
Pilate's Question—By Rev. Sinclair Carolin, M.A. 4
Light and Darkness—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. 6
Missed Opportunities—By Bishop of Ripon... ... 13
Tenderness—By Bishop of Durham 18
The Value of the Miraculous—By Rev. J. Lightfoot, D.Sc., M.A.... 25
Funeral Reform—By Rev. F. Lawrence, B.A. ... 28
National Mourning—By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 37
The Ministry of Angels—By Rev. J. Reid, M.A. .. 39
Danger of Forsaking Duty's Path—By Rev. E. F. Chapman, M.A. 42
Two Aspects of Death—By Rev. Canon Scott-Holland, M.A. 49
Covetousness—By Rev. George Bladon 53
The Confederating Force of Sorrow—By Very Rev. Francis Paget, D.D. 61
The Church of God—By Rev. Canon Crozier, D.D. 63
True Freedom in the Church—By Rev. W. J. Knox-Little, M.A. 73
"For they Rest from their Labours—By Rev. John Penfold 77
Times of Pestilence—By Rev. William Ince, D.D... 85
Death—By Rev. Charles C. Collins, M.A.... ... 88
Fervent Prayer—By Rev. Walter Lock, M.A. ... 97
The Childhood of our Present Life—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. 100
Lent—By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 109
In Memoriam—William Henry Burrows—By Rev. C. W. Furse 112
The Duke of Clarence's Death—By Rev. P. F. Eliot, M.A. 121
Continuity in Service—By Rev. J. Reid, M.A. ... 123
The Value of a Personal God—By Rev. W. C. Newbolt, M.A. 133
Burial Reform—By Rev. F. Lawrence, B.A. ... 136
The Responsibility of Power—By Bishop of Ripon 145
Sacrifice—By Rev. R. S. Hassard, M.A. 150
The Holy Communion: Its Nature and Design—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A. 157
Freedom and Truth—By Rev. John Penfold ... 160
The Tenth Commandment—By Ven. F. W. Farrar D.D. 169
Our Neighbour's Faults—By Rev. Richard W. Hiley, D.D. 172
Caiaphas—Cephas—Jesus—By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 181
The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ—By Rev. Charles Gore, M.A. 184

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

Trust in God the Source of Peace—By Rev. G. Jannings, M.A. 193
Views of Salvation as Affecting Practice—By Rev. W. A. Cutting, M.A. 195
The Gospel of Personal Service — By Rev. J. Percival 205
Regeneration—By Rev. J. Reid, M.A. 217
The Power of the Resurrection—By Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol... 229
Creation and Science—By Rev. Prebendary Bassett, M.A. 232
Our Appointed Sphere—By Rev. Canon Scott-Holland 241
Seeing and Believing—By Rev. John Seller, F.S.Sc. 245
Choice Between the Material and the Spiritual—By Bishop of Ripon 253
The Introit of the Soul.—I.—Faith—By Rev. S. J. Sykes, B.A. 258
The Blessing of the Triune God—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. 265
"Not to all the People"—By Rev. John Seller, F.S.Sc. 267
The Introit of the Soul.—II.—Repentance—By Rev. S. J. Sykes, B.A.... 270
The Growth of Jesus—By Rev. Canon H. Scott-Holland 277
Preaching the Gospel of Christ—By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, M.A 281
The Introit of the Soul.—III.—Love—By Rev. S. J. Sykes, B.A. 283
Two of Christ's Visions—By Rev. Canon H. Scott-Holland 289
Neo-Platonism and Socialism Hostile to Christianity By Rev. W. Bussell, M.A. 301

SERMONS BY :—

Bishop of Durham—Tenderness 18
Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol—The Power of the Resurrection 229
Bishop of Ripon—Missed Opportunities 13
Bishop of Ripon—The Responsibility of Power .. 145
Bishop of Ripon—Choice Between the Material and the Spiritual 253
Bassett, Rev. Prebendary, M.A.—Creation and Science 232
Bladon, Rev. George—Covetousness 53
Bussell, Rev. W., M.A.—Neo-Platonism and Socialism Hostile to Christianity 301
Carolin, Rev. Sinclair, M.A.—Pilate's Question ... 4
Chapman, Rev. E. F., M.A.—Danger of Forsaking Duty's Path 42

283.05
C#40
V.33

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Collins, Rev. Charles C., M.A.—Death 88
Crozier, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Church of God ... 63
Cutting, Rev. W. A., M.A.—Views of Salvation as Affecting Practice... 195
Eliot, Rev. P. F., M.A.—The Duke of Clarence's Death 121
Farrar, Ven. F. W., D.D., F.R.S.—The Tenth Commandment 169
Furse, Rev. C. W.—*In Memoriam*—William Henry Burrows 112
Gore, Rev. Charles, M.A.—The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ 184
Hassard, Rev. R. S., M.A.—Sacrifice 150
Hiley, Rev. Richard W., D.D.—Our Neighbour's Faults 172
Ince, Rev. William, D.D.—Times of Pestilence ... 85
Jannings, Rev. G., M.A.—Trust in God, the Source of Peace 193
Knox-Little, Rev. W. J., M.A.—True Freedom in the Church... 73
Lawrence, Rev. F., B.A.—Funeral Reform... ... 28
Lawrence, Rev. F., B.A.—Burial Reform 136
Lightfoot, Rev. J., D.Sc., M.A.—"The Value of the Miraculous 25
Lock, Rev. Walter, M.A.—Fervent Prayer ... 97
Maturin, Rev. B., M.A.—The Holy Communion: Its Nature and Design 157
Napleton, Rev. John—Early Confidence the Key to Social Purity 1
Newbolt, Rev. W. C., M.A.—The Value of a Personal God 133
Paget, Very Rev. Francis, D.D.—"The Confederating Force of Sorrow 61
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A.—Preaching the Gospel of Christ 281
Penfold, Rev. John—"For they Rest from their Labours" 77
Penfold, Rev. John—Freedom and Truth 160
Percival Rev. J.—The Gospel of Personal Service ... 205
Rawstorne, Rev. W. E., M.A.—National Mourning 37
Rawstorne, Rev. W. E., M.A.—Lent 109
Rawstorne, Rev. W. E., M.A.—Caiaphas—Cephas —Jesus 181
Reid, Rev. J., M.A.—The Ministry of Angels ... 39
Reid, Rev. J., M.A.—Continuity in Service .. 123
Reid, Rev. J., M.A.—Regeneration... 217
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon, M.A.—Two Aspects of Death 49
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon—Our Appointed Sphere 241
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon H.—The Growth of Jesus 277
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon H.—Two of Christ's Visions 289
Seller, Rev. John, F.S.Sc.—Seeing and Believing... 245
Seller, Rev. John, F.S.Sc.—Not to all the People... 267
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—Light and Darkness 6
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—The Childhood of our Present Life 100
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—The Blessing of the Triune God 265
Sykes, Rev. S. J., B.A.—The Introit of the Soul.—I.—Faith 258
Sykes, Rev. S. J., B.A.—The Introit of the Soul.—II.—Repentance 270
Sykes, Rev. S. J., B.A.—The Introit of the Soul.—III.—Love 283

TEXTS TO SERMONS :—

1 Thessalonians v. 22 1
John xviii. 38 4
Ecclesiastes xi. 7, 8 6
Jeremiah xxxii. 8. 13
Hebrews v. 2 18
Luke xvi. 31 25
Ecclesiastes xii. 7 28

TEXTS TO SERMONS :— PAGE

2 Chronicles xxxv. 24, 25 37
Job i. 14... 39
1 Kings xix. 9 42
Luke xxiv. 37 49
S. Luke xii. 15 53
Romans xii. 15... 61
1 Timothy iii. 15 63
Galatians iv. 26... 73
1 Peter v. 6, 7 85
1 Samuel xx. 3... 88
S. James v. 16 97
1 Corinthians xiii. 11 100
Mark vi. 31 109
Job. xxviii. 28 112
1 Samuel iii. 18 121
1 Samuel xii. 14 123
Exodus xx. 3 133
Numbers xx. 26 136
S. John xi. 37 145
S. Matthew xx. 28 150
Luke xxii. 19 157
S. John viii. 32... 160
Exodus xx. 17 169
S. Matthew viii. 3-5 172
Isaiah liii. 6 181
Hebrews ix. 13, 14 184
Isaiah xxvi. 3 193
Titus ii. 11-14 195
S. Luke xxii. 26, 27 205
John iii. 3 217
1 Thessalonians iv. 14... 229
Genesis i. 1 232
John xxi. 20, 21, 22 241
S. John xx. 28, 29 245
John xviii. 40 253
S. Mark ix. 24 258
Numbers vi. 22-27 265
Acts x. 40, 41 267
S. Matthew, iv. 17 270
Luke ii. 48, 49 277
2 Corinthians x. 14 281
1 John iv. 8. 283
John xxi. 20 289
Ephesians v. 8. 301

LEADING ARTICLES :—

St. John's Foundation School... 8
"Over the Traces" 9
The Shah's Tyranny 22
Christianity Abroad 29
The Cardinal 44
The Bible and the Critics 55
Death of Canon Crosthwaite 56
The Rev. C. H. Spurgeon 67
Sir Morell Mackenzie 78
The London County Council 91
The Rev. Dr. Donald Fraser, D.D. 91
Old Age Pensions 103
The Newman Memorial at Oxford 115
The Church of England Year Book 127
"Well Done, My Lord" 139
"The Mice in Council" 153
The Public and the Proctors 164
Newspaper Ethics 174
The Haydock Difficulty 189
Crushed 196
Unpractised Principles 211
May Day in Hyde Park 222
Deeming 237
Church Defence 248
Decent Pictures 260
Parliament 272
Warning to Nonconformists 272
Begging 285
The Trinity Ordination 293
The Injudicious Hooker 308

988267

PAPERS :— PAGE

Unity—Unity—Unity—By Rev. H. G. Rosedale, M.A. 30
The Comparative Claims of Public and Private Ministrations upon the Time of the Parish Priest—By Rev. W. E. W. Carr, M.A. ... 56
The Recent Peace Congress at Rome 68
Some Thoughts on the Evidences—By A. J. Melhuish, F.R.A.S. 79
William Reeves, Lord Bishop of Down, and Connor, and Dromore—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, D.D. 80, 92, 104, 116, 128
Some Thoughts on the Future State of the Unsaved —By A. J. Melhuish, F.R.A S.... 139
An Inquiry into the Times of the First Fifty Days and Events of Our Lord's Life 154
The Book of Armagh—By Late Most Rev. William Reeves, D.D. 165, 176, 190, 201, 212
English Agricultural Labourers—By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 197
The Argument from Design—By Rev. John Lightfoot, D.Sc.... 208
The Tripartite Nature of Man—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. 224
The Peaceful Persecuted Stundists 249
Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.—By Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D.D. 261
The Threefold Nature of Man 294
In Memoraim—Henry Lindsay 296

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"*The Expositor*" 22, 94, 117, 202 250
"*The Expository Times*" 22, 107, 117, 191, 250 286
"The Sermon Bible." Vol. VIII. 31
"The Real Presence and Adoration in the Eucharist as Taught, etc."—By William Ince 31
"*The Thinker*" 58, 107, 177
"The Divine Library of the Old Testament"—By Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D. 68
"The Cloud of Witnesses"—By Hon. Mrs. Lyttelton Gell 69
"*The Sword and the Trowel*" 69
"*The Treasury*" 69, 166
"The Analogy of Existences and Christianity"—By Charles J. Wallace, M.A. 107
"From the Usher's Desk to the Tabernacle Pulpit" —By Rev. R. Spindler 141
"Memories of Stambourne"—By C. H. Spurgeon and B. Beddow 141
"Memorial to Viscount Cross." "Substitutes for the Opium Revenue"—By T. G. Alexander. "The Opium Trade, as Affecting British Commerce with China"—By David McLaren ... 225
"The Sermon Bible." Vol. IX. 296

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Is there a Purgatory? 10, 23, 45, 58, 82, 95, 108, 119, 142
Presbyterian Orders Disallowed 11, 47
Mr. Carolin's Quotation 24
The Masoretic Notes to the Old Testament... ... 32
The Declaration of Holy Scripture 34, 70
Apostasy, Jewish and Christian 34
Review of Dr. Ince's Sermon... 47
Irish Church Prayer-Book 47

CORRESPONDENCE :— PAGE

Rational Conceptions of the Future Life 70
Saving Life at Funerals 70
Cardinal Newman a Plagiarist ... 117, 131, 166
Faith as a Faculty ... 118, 130, 141, 155, 167, 178
The Purpose of God cannot be Frustrated 129
Eternal Destruction *versus* Aionial Purgatory and Endless Torment 142, 167, 178, 191, 202, 213, 220, 238, 250, 262, 273, 286, 296, 309
The Public and the Proctors 179
Unwise Restrictions for the Clergy 213
Kanaka Labour in Queensland 214, 239
A Cheap and Good Holiday 227
The Pentecostal Gift 238
The Cambridge Case 251, 274
Prebendary Bassett's Sermon... ... 274, 298, 311
The Catechism in Schools 299
Protection of Mourners at the Graveside 299
Saved by Fire—Ψυχικός 310

MISCELLANEOUS :—

East London Church Fund 11
Presentation to the Bishop of Coventry (Dr. Bowlby) 11, 103
C.M.S.'s Steamer to Lake Victoria 11
Church Schools in Bradford 11
Funeral Reform Association ... 11, 131, 153, 222, 236
Manchester Diocesan Directory 35
Peace Congress of Rome 36
The New Master of Pembroke College, Oxford 44, 47
Inhibition to Preach in a Presbyterian Church ... 66
Secretary to the Corporation of Church House ... 71
Archdeacon Robeson 71
Election to the Vicarage of Kirkdale 71
Cardinal Newman's Statue at Oxford ... 71, 83
The late E. Goodwyn Lewis's Paintings 72
Professor of Music at Oxford 83
Bodley's Librarian at Oxford 84
The Mersey Mission to Seamen 84
Summer Session of Mansfield College 90
Rochester Diocesan Chronicle 90
Intolerance of the West Ham School Board ... 108
Archdeacon Palmes 120
The late Miss A. J. Clough 163
Scholarships at Oakham and Uppingham Schools... 188
Winchester Diocesan Conference 215
The Cambridge Vice-Chancellor's Court 227
Professor Sayce's Lectures 236
New Assistant-Secretary to the E.C.U. 236
Resignation of Dean Bickersteth 247
New Archdeacon of Suffolk 275
New Bishop of Sodor and Man 275
The S.P.G. in Wales 275
St. David's Diocesan Conference 311
The Sons of the Clergy 311

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 131, 143, 156, 167, 179, 192, 203, 215, 227, 239, 252, 263, 275, 288, 300, 312

CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

The Church of England Pulpit
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 836.] SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1892. [PRICE ONE PENNY.

The Church of England Pulpit.

EARLY CONFIDENCE THE KEY TO SOCIAL PURITY.

BY THE REV. JOHN NAPLETON, RECTOR OF WYMINGTON.

SERMON PREACHED AT WYMINGTON CHURCH, ON SUNDAY, OCTOBER 11TH, 1891.

"Abstain from all appearance of evil."—1 THESS. v. 22.

TO creatures of a day, for whom every hour brings some change, who cannot physically or morally remain in the same condition for any length of time, the ascription of glory to God—"as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be"—has an imposing, thrilling significance which men are not wont to discover in those oft repeated words. During our life the standard we constantly set before ourselves is, as our character gets mature and settled, a constant and unflinching adherence to principle—an uniformity of conduct. But how feeble is our utmost effort, how puerile our success, as compared with the broken vow, the frequent fall? Yet this is what we all aim at, and pride ourselves on, such measure of trustworthiness as we are enabled to obtain in the eyes of our fellow-men. And if we so highly esteem the confidence of the small circle wherein we live and move, oh, how vastly more worthy, more exalted, must that character be which has earned from the whole world, from every generation, the unanimous vote of praise as well as of confidence! "Glory to God—as it was, is, and ever shall be given, world without end!" What then is the foundation—the root of this universal homage? How has God been able to prove Himself more reliable than the children of men? By reason of His perfectly pure nature and impartial dealings He is innocent of all evil—there is no unrighteousness in Him—and when you have said this you have exposed the weakness in all human character. What is untainted with evil must needs be immortal, and in a world where immortality is not known, such as the physical, material world of which we as human beings form a part, there cannot be found perfect innocence. Innocence—purity—the feeble shadows of these unfading and undying graces which we meet with on earth, what are they when compared with the substance only to be found among the hosts of heaven, with the standard set up in the revealed word of God? And first in importance when analysing the Divine expression of this His foremost attribute comes His absolute ignorance of evil. He will not know it, for He is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. His justice, His holiness require that He should punish it; but, while He comprehends it, knowing of it, and hates it accordingly, He will not, cannot know it, or touch the accursed thing, except to blast it with the breath of His displeasure. Not to know evil! And is it possible for man—sin-tainted mortal man—not to know evil? Only in and through the washing of regeneration—through the sacred heart of his Redeemer, who knew no sin, if he wash and be clean in the mingling tide of blood and water. And even, as our Article has it, even then, in those that are regenerate, the infection of nature doth yet remain, so long as they are compassed about with infirmity in this mortal body. But, my hearers, we may approach closer and closer to our God—we may become more estranged from the evil of our natural lusts and appetites, if we obey the Apostolic injunction to keep ourselves pure, and present our bodies unblameable, unspotted and unabashed, before the far-searching eye of Him who knoweth whereof we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust. To unlearn what is of evil—the knowledge which has cost us so much from the earliest days of our consciousness that there were two opposing powers at our beck and call, the right of choice between them being set clearly before us—"Choose ye this day whom ye will serve"—this must be our constant aim through life. Why is it that some of us can and do look back upon the years of our childhood with such blissful heart-refreshing memories? Because then we were innocent of evil—we knew not nor suspected the existence of those warring elements that ere long began to chide, and fray and mar our happiness, of the iron that was ere long to enter into our very souls—when death was but a name, and cruel change or poverty had not deprived us of earthly treasures and comforts, transforming our hopes into fears, our ardent

longings into bitter disappointments. Ah yes! The voice of nature then was the voice of God, because we saw in His works the answer to these simple, pure, healthy cravings of a soul unsullied by the thought, much less the sad experience that all was not bright and beautiful in our sunny sided world, of a soul which echoed the words, "trust in the living God who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." Parents and guardians, upon whom is laid the charge of so many fresh young plants, see to it with the utmost caution, the most fostering care that you train them up for their high vocation, namely, to blossom and bloom in the garden of the soul which God Himself hath planted. Especially we say to those who live among the beauteous gifts of a bountiful providence spread over the hills and dales, the woods and fields of the country side, make the delights of the open air and the glorious sunshine speak to the noble, the generous, and the reverent impulses within those opening minds, and blend with what nature teaches the teaching of your own bright, kind and unselfish example. You must be bright with those who know nothing of the sorrowful tears they will learn all too soon to shed—you must be kind with those whom you wish to obey you cheerfully—and unselfish if you would win their respect, and make them respected in their turn.

Alas, how little are these duties heeded—these privileges valued? In the crowded city we expect to meet with the most lamentable precociousness to evil, because human beings are so often herded together like pigs in a sty, but why should it be so prevalent as it very commonly is in the country villages scattered throughout the length and breadth of our land? Why indeed we may well ask. Because men are lovers of self rather than lovers of God—they care more for the indulgence of their own selfish lusts than for gaining the blessing God sends to them, or would send to them in their children. God has spoken of children as conferring a blessing. "Blessed is the man that hath his quiver full of them." Yes, but not the self-loving, uncontrolled brute who sets before them an example of vice, and nourishes them with cursing, blows and blasphemy. Not the man who leaves to his hardworking, worn-out wife the entire charge of their common offspring, and cares not what they do or where they go, so long as they do not cost him money or get into public disgrace. And do not take to yourselves comfort and congratulate yourselves that these words do not apply to *you*, working men who have no trouble with your children, who find everything orderly on your return home, and hear no complaints; but on the contrary are told that they are all doing well at school. School! School! Was it to the schoolmaster or to the parent that God said: "Train up a child in the way he should go?" It is your duty—your bounden duty, every working man in the land, to know what is going on in your children's hearts, to make them love, and also reverence you: then, and not otherwise, does God promise they shall be a blessing to you. Moreover, if you try to do your duty, however hard it appear, honestly try and persevere, you will find that, in spite of all the care and anxiety connected with their bringing up, they are indeed "as arrows in the hand of the giant" unto you—they will extend your influence, your usefulness, your good name, and be a source of strength in your declining years. The other side is a pitiable contrast; but we must not pass it by. What mean the sights so frequently seen in a country village—the assemblage on the green or by the roadside of youths who have almost entered upon man's estate, with their hands in their pockets, and it may be a short pipe in their mouths, or gambling with marbles or for the few halfpence they possess? Or on the Lord's Day, a crowd of loiterers hanging about the precincts of the Church, and molesting those whom they dare with a senseless laugh or a foolish jest? What, we say, can these sights mean, but that there are several homes in that parish where mother or father, perhaps both, have not kept a watchful eye upon their offspring in those early years when the seed was being sown, or that they have afterwards suffered them to be led astray by evil companions. You must also note the outcome of such neglect and its consequent mischief to the rising generation. You will almost invariably find that in such a place or neighbourhood the practice of social purity is at a very startling discount. The sin of fornication is practised in the most unblushing, shameless manner, and to an almost incredible extent, while the fathers of nameless children are rather proud than otherwise of being called upon by the local authority to pay to the woman they have injured a paltry allowance which, to them, is the only reminder that they have transgressed the law of God and of man, and with which they consider their duty to their children begins and ends. Or still worse, the idleness we mentioned is often the parent of greater sins than this, of such things as should not be once named among Christians. And can it be wondered at? If, instead of being guided by the apostolic rule, and abstaining from all appearance of evil, the young are allowed to converse openly with one another upon topics they would, or ought to be, ashamed to mention in the presence of their parents? If the parents themselves exercise no self-control, but the father uses obscene language savoured with blasphemy in the presence of his daughters, while the mother speaks and acts before her growing boys with entire absence of self-respect, the consequence is inevitable. Not only do young men lose all sense of modesty, but young women despise their own sex as well as the other. These things are not imaginations nor suggestions, they are to be found in both town and country alike, though in different forms. The remedies proposed for the vice that is doing

so much to eat out the health and manhood of our nation are numerous, varied, and often dangerous and misleading; but this vice in its horrible many-sidedness has done far more to degrade England than even drunkenness, its handmaiden. But more can be done by the force of example, and the careful choice of associations for the young than by any other means. An incalculable power rests in the hands of parents, from them must come that sense of chivalry which all purity societies can but faintly grasp when they pledge young men to "honour women," and young women to obey St. Paul's command, "Keep thyself pure." Your first step in this path of duty must be to gain and keep the confidence of your children from their earliest years. Draw them tenderly towards you—so tenderly, so carefully that they do not feel afraid or ashamed to confide in you their inmost thoughts and feelings. In the early years you will by this means, if you have any wisdom, tact or discretion, be able to guide and govern their young impulses. Want of confidence in the great Father of all was the secret of the fall of man. Had Eve confided to God her conversation with the evil spirit, disguised as a serpent, she would never have followed his advice and eaten of the tree of knowledge. You must teach your children to come to you when they desire to do either what you have expressly forbidden, or what their conscience tells them you would prohibit. Then the keenly felt, yet subtle risings of all impure passion may by you be perceived and restrained, and the nobility of true modesty and genuine self-respect be early infused into the as yet untainted spirit. Remember the first thing Eve did after she had sinned was to hide herself. From a false shame at wishing to disobey God, she passed to a real and crushing shame when she knew she had sinned against Him. Oh the knowledge of evil, what a curse it is! Keep it from the young ones till it is needful that it should be met and overcome. And if you have followed the course we recommend, setting a pure example before your children and winning their confidence, you will have given them a safeguard when the time comes for association with others in the outside world. In the school, in the shop, among their fellow-servants or companions, your children will go encased in an armour which no rules and regulations can gird them with—they will esteem their own personal purity of more value than the approval of their associates, whose gibes and sneers will fall harmless upon the rock of their intense individualism, their acute sense of God's presence, and their true shame at the idea of defiling their bodies, the temple of the Holy Ghost. You may link your child to all the external societies for the promotion of purity in existence, you may lecture to them for hours in the conventional phraseology of the subject, but it will all be as dust before the wind if you have not implanted in their spirits that sense of intense individual responsibility which begins with the very dawn of consciousness. Of course we do not say this is an unfailing panacea for the corruption of the heart, that is deceitful above all things; but it is the root and ground-work of all successful dealing with the sensual passions. Were it carried out more generally there would be a spirit of true chivalry among our youth, who, instead of priding themselves on the extent of their shameless impurity as is too often the case, would vie with each other in modesty of demeanour and purity of heart and of body, of word and of deed and of thought, in abstaining from all appearance of evil. We might say much on the causes which conspire to produce the evil results we deplore; but that is not to our present purpose. We are fully sensible of the evils of overcrowding, of the bitter cry of outcast London and other closely packed cities. But all we insist on now is that the heart of man is the same everywhere if not kept with all diligence and watchfulness, and therefore it does not necessarily follow that the more benighted in spiritual matters a place or town may be, the more depraved it becomes. We will close with an allegory illustrative of this point. An overseer of a large town parish was seated reading the accounts of crime in the metropolis, and thinking how much more degraded were the town poor than those in country places. Just as he looked up from his newspaper an angel smote his face with his wing, and extending his hand, said: "Come with me and you shall judge of that for yourself." The overseer trembled. "Who are you?" he asked of the angel. "I am one of heaven's guardians of the poor," was the reply. Hearing this he resigned himself to the celestial visitor, who bore him swiftly to the heart of London. Hovering over the fog and smoke they suddenly swooped, all unseen by the jostling, shrieking crowd below, and stood in a narrow thoroughfare filled with costermongers' carts and eager buyers—some eating the stale food, others fighting and quarrelling among themselves. On one side of the street was a baker's shop, on the other a tall spire, with iron gates standing open. Through these gates they entered into a long corridor, which led into a large church, the corridor being designed to shut off the noise outside. A man stood at the entrance to the spire and urged the passers by to come in. "Enter, enter, good people," he cried, "it is Good Friday; come and keep this holy day." Some few heeded the call, though multitudes ignored it. As the stray ones came in, the overseer noted how wretched they looked, and one of them said he was too vile to have entered directly into God's house, where he had not been for many years, since the former pastor died; but the gradual approach of the corridor made him less fearful. The overseer was much troubled to know how these outsiders would behave in the church. He feared, there being no service at that hour, that they would grow dissatisfied, and disperse.

But as the door opened to admit them, the organ began to play, and when it ceased the seats were filled with shadowy forms—the occupants who had sat there in years gone by, the vacant places being taken by the stray few who had come in at the herald's call. Then a long prayer was heard and joined in by the whole congregation, and then the sound of a voice that had long been silent in the grave fell from the pulpit, and the former pastor addressed the living and the dead from the words: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." Then the angel touched his companion, saying, "Mark them well, those poor souls who having heard the herald's cry have responded, and come in here to worship. This is the town, come now to the country." They then rose again through the roof of the church, and above the grimy streets they travelled swiftly some sixty miles. There the opening buds and the wild flowers and tender leaves bespoke the early spring, whose sweet harbinger was heard in the distant woods. They stopped at another church. The shadows were beginning to fall, and the sound of noisy boys and young men racing to and fro in and around God's acre disturbed the calm and otherwise peaceful scene. Presently some of the rioters rushed boisterously within the sacred walls, laughing and pushing one another as if they had been on the village green. Soon there was some sort of order restored, and these young people joined with the older members of the choir in rehearsing the music for Easter Day. While they were singing, the angel pointed to the open door and said: "Watch those who enter!" Two able-bodied youths then crept stealthily up the side aisle, and one of them kept watch, while the other defiled the sanctuary by committing an outrage upon the commonest decency that would have ensured his death under the law of Moses, and which, treated even as a civil offence by the law of our country, would have sent him to prison without the option of a fine. "Say now," said the angel, "which is the more degraded of the two—the poor outcast of a crowded city, who felt that the Church was none other than the house of God, and wished to approach it slowly and reverently out of the turmoil of the world through the long corridor; or this well cared for and so-called respectable youth, who enters the holy place with stealthy tread, only in order to desecrate it so vilely." "Surely," replied the scandalised parish official, "he is more contemptible than the dynamitards who would destroy our public buildings."

And is not this the opinion of every honest man and woman among us? Does it not prove that when the passions are let loose it matters not what may be the surroundings—the closely packed town, or the beautiful country? The beauties of nature cannot gauge the corrupt heart! How unswerving, unexceptional, is that law of God, that no unclean person shall enter into His kingdom! "For what communion hath light with darkness? Wherefore come out and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you and be a Father unto you, saith the Lord Almighty."

PILATE'S QUESTION.

By the Rev. SINCLAIR CAROLIN, M.A., Rector of Wyvenhoe, Essex.

Sermon preached in St. Matthew's, Denmark-hill.

"Pilate sayeth unto him, What is truth?"—John xviii. 38.

LORD BACON begins one of his admirable essays thus: "What is Truth? said jesting Pilate, and waited not for an answer." Let us, my brethren, ask what is truth? and wait, search, find an answer, bind it about our neck, yea, write it upon the tablets of the heart and life. But can we, amid the perplexing mazes of error, amid the dense entanglements of sects, and creeds and parties, amid the dissolving scepticism of modern science and philosophy, discover what is truth? The Gospel from which my text is taken furnishes us with a reply. "The Spirit of God," says our Lord Himself, in the sixteenth chapter of St. John, "shall guide you into all truth." Bright, happy and cheering, then, is the search for those in whom is God's holy spirit; dark, discouraging, hopeless, for those who seek the light by the torch of education or intellect alone. It is a question whether Pilate's inquiry was prompted by an honest desire to hear and learn from Christ's lips or not. If he was sincere, I cannot, and I am sure you cannot, fail to sympathise with him. There was so much apparently against Christ's professions and His claims, when Pilate looked around and saw a few humble men his followers, their Master on trial for sedition, little to recommend and nothing to convince save an extraordinary and seemingly incredible story. On hearing from an obscure Jew, a prisoner, the mysterious announcement, "My kingdom is not of this world: if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews, what other question could have suggested itself to Pilate than that which fell from his lips: "Art Thou a king then?" And when Christ endeavoured to explain that His kingdom was Righteousness and Truth, the wondering Roman may well have been sincere in asking, "What is Truth?" Moreover, when we read on through the next chapter, and find Pilate stating three times, publicly, "I find no fault in Him at all," endeavouring to release Him, shuddering when he heard that He had declared Himself to be the Son of God, but allowing the dread of lost popularity, and probably prefer-

ment, to outweigh considerations of truth, honour and justice, it is difficult, I think, to avoid coming to the conclusion that Pilate's question was put in all sincerity and honesty of purpose. No doubt, however, the weight of opinion and traditional interpretation tends to the opposite conclusion, that this question was put, if not in absolute scepticism, in careless indifferentism.

"What is Truth? said jesting Pilate, and waited not for an answer." And so understood, Pilate's words have been the theme of many an indignant protest against the unreality and listlessness of Him who uttered them. But yet, my brethren, we who censure an uninformed and unenlightened Roman, are we so superior to him? Are we so jealous of the truth that, esteeming it a pearl of great price we seek it at all hazards, practise it at all risks, recommend it in all cases, are ready even to die for it?

We may think lightly, perhaps, of the blinded heathen governor, who recked so little of human sacrifices, who found a suicide's grave at last, having turned a deaf ear to Christ's message of truth; but are we much better ourselves? Nay, rather are we not often far more blameworthy than he? Pilate knew not the truth, and cared not to know it. We know the truth, and too often esteem it not. Oh! let us all remember that the servant who knows his Lord's will and does it not shall be beaten with many stripes, and beware of the deadly sin of indifference and want of earnestness in our religious life. A writer of the day has called this an age of shams. There is a great deal of truth in the statement. What, for instance, does the expression "a religious person" mean in its common usage? One who goes to Church Sunday and week-day, who loses no opportunity, public or private, of talking about religion, who distributes tracts bearing upon their supposed errors of faith and practice amongst his acquaintance, who checks the flow of natural energy and enthusiasm in the young, and wears habitually a subdued and melancholy look—in short, the mark and character which the world designates by the name of religious, are one and all of them external, and inevitably so, for to the greater part of men it is too much trouble to investigate further. Again, how many are deceiving themselves, fancying they are serving God by regular attendance at Church, by denunciations of sin, by horror at their neighbour's want of orthodoxy, by abusing horse-racing, dancing, theatre-going, while all the time they are bowing down before the only God they really worship, "Public opinion." Far be it from any of us to condemn the lowly penitent sinner who strives to live in the fear of God and the keeping of His commandments, not casting a stone at his neighbour, but loving as Christ did even the fallen: but woe, ten times woe to the hypocrites who, exact in minor duties, neglect those that are important, who have a form of godliness, but know nothing of its power, who are loud in proclaiming their orthodoxy, but yet lack even a single spark of Christian charity towards their fellow-men. To apply what I have been saying to ourselves: There are, then, obvious and most practical duties which the consideration of my subject suggests. (1) We must be true to one another; (2) we must be true to ourselves; and (3) we must be true to God. We must first be true to one another. Not one of us stands alone. No man liveth to himself. We are bound together by common hopes, common interests, common duties, common affections. If we be true to one another we shall not seek our own; there can be no treacheries, no falsities among us; no influences to subtly corrupt, no lies to secretly undermine; but, in word and deed, a nobility and a loyalty which renders all baseness impossible between man and man.

We who are set to exhort you must be thoroughly loyal to you by never forgetting how solemn is our responsibility for those your interests which are entrusted to our care; loyal to you by considering your welfare our own; loyal to you by never allowing a thought of popularity to distort our judgment and our speech by one hairs-breadth from what is right; loyal to you, therefore, by often saying, not what you like, but what you need—not what might please you best for the moment, but what will be best for you in the end.

And you, too, must be no less faithful to us: faithful even when we ask you to do hard things and make sacrifices, when we tell you what is true and unpleasant, yes, even when we fall short ourselves of the standard we hold up to you, remembering that we are all struggling together to follow, though at a great distance, our Divine Master; and you must be faithful to one another. When you meet daily, in your business and your pleasures, cherish in your hearts not only a holy charity one for the other, but with it a deep reverence for the awfulness before God of your common nature and your common immortality. Yes! be true to one another. Behold how good and pleasant a thing it is, brethren, to dwell together in unity. In lowliness of heart let each of you esteem others better than himself. Bear ye one another's burthens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.

But remember that you cannot be quite true to one another unless you are true to your own selves. As our greatest poet has said,

> To thine own self be true,
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

And to be true to yourselves is to be true to your higher nature, true to the aims and purposes of a soul created in God's own image. He who degrades God's high ideal for his mortal life, he who sows to the flesh and not to the spirit, he who prefers the death of sin to the life of righteousness, and to the impulses of his lower nature sacrifices the glories of his higher and eternal destiny, such

a one is a traitor to himself. To be true to yourself you must take, as the one law of your being, that only which is best and purest and likest God. And, lastly, as you cannot be true to one another without being true to yourselves, so neither can you be true to yourselves if you are not true to God. He has made your heart His dwelling-place; you must be true to Him by not defiling it with idols. He has made the fortress of your soul strong for Himself; you must be true to Him by not betraying it to devils. He has given you faculties, opportunities; you must be true to Him by employing them in His service. He has entrusted to you, as to a labourer, the vineyard which His right hand has planted; you must be true to Him by winning for Him its fruits of increase. Strive to be true to Him by obeying His precepts, by being constantly humble and penitent for constant sin, coming before Him in this His house with meek heart and due reverence; coming here, not to dream or smile or trifle, but to hear, praise, and pray; listening to the messages He sends you here, as to words delivered to your own individual souls.

LIGHT AND DARKNESS.

By the Rev. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Christ Church, Rotherhithe.

Sermon Preached at Christ Church, Rotherhithe, on Sunday Morning, November 22nd, 1891.

"Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun; but if a man live many years, and rejoice in them all; yet let him remember the days of darkness; for they shall be many. All that cometh is vanity."—Ecclesiastes xi. 7, 8 (First Lesson).

THE Song of Solomon, says Matthew Henry, is fitly placed after Ecclesiastes, for in the one we have the vanity of the creature set forth and in the other the love of the Redeemer. The Song of Solomon was read by the Jews at the Feast of Passover, the festival of a glorious deliverance out of Egypt, but the Book of Ecclesiastes at the Feast of Tabernacles, the memorial of the wanderings in the wilderness. The purpose of this book is to convince men of the vanity of the world, and thus to lead them to right thoughts of the invisible and eternal God. "Remember the days of darkness" is the precept preparatory to "Remember thy Creator." The experience of the wisest of men is placed at our disposal, and we may learn from his example to estimate aright the pomp and circumstance of the world and to fix our hearts upon that life which is life indeed. The preacher's words are, as he tells us, not only acceptable words, but words of uprightness and truth. His discourse is not like much that passes for preaching—the fine-spun theories of scholasticism—but the vital principles of a profound wisdom. The book, in short, is a digest of moral and practical philosophy. Christ hallowed the Temple not only by teaching within its courts Himself, but by driving out now and again the chaffering traffickers that bought and sold therein. Even so such Scriptures as Ecclesiastes do the work of Christ by clearing the heart of the vain and worldly thoughts that find a dwelling there and so making room for Him.

Our text may be taken as a summary of the whole book of Ecclesiastes.

I. *God created the world of nature for the enjoyment of man.* It is a common error that religion is the killjoy of life. It is associated with all that is melancholy—"graves and worms and epitaphs." It is supposed to crush all natural aspirations and to stifle human feeling. Nor must we expect wholly to remove such association of ideas from the minds of men. Sinners will in spite of the plainest teaching of Scripture find some excuse for not leading a godly life. Yet we may and we must bear witness to the gladness of divine service and to the joy that is ministered by the sights and sounds of nature. For truly "the light is sweet."

"Sunshine is ever joyous,
Its birthplace is in yonder orb which flings
O'er vale and cliff its wealth of rosy smiles.
Each sunbeam seems the very soul of joy;
No sadness soils it; scattering gladsomeness
Like a bright angel onward still it moves.
The very churchyard brightens as the ray
Alights upon its tombstones, and the turf
Seems strangely heaving to the radiant glow
As if foredating the expected sunrise
When at the first gleam of the morning star
The faithful grave shall render up its treasure;
And sunshine such as earth has never known
Shall fill these skies with mirth and smiles and beauty,
Erasing each sad wrinkle from their brow
Which the long curse had deeply graven there."*

"Truly the light is sweet." It was the first-born of our creation. It is the smile of God. And as like a divine seal it falls upon the darkling earth a thousand forms of grandeur and beauty start into view. "The outgoings of the morning and evening sing" (Ps. lxv. 8, margin), for light is but another form of sound, and as the sunbeam gives the keynote of creation's anthem, the whole world wakes to God's praise.

And how sweet to the sight is the light of heaven. "A pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun." It gladdens with its guidance the worn-out mariner after the perils of a stormy night. It lightens the traveller oppressed by the long-brooding gloom. It cheers the night-long weary watcher, and revives the sick-bed sufferer tossing to and fro till the dawning of the day. Men rejoice in its glory and find in it the story of their life. Nay, more. So important an element is it of our earthly being that light is put for life and to see the sun is a phrase that denotes the sum and substance of this world's existence. "God

* Dr. H. Bonar.

has made everything beautiful in its time" (Eccl. iii. 11), and man's verdict is but an echo of God's Word as the secrets of nature are brought to view for everything is found to be very good.

Why then, may we ask, is not man contented and happy in the enjoyment of God's works and in communion with God Himself? If the light is so blessed and if life is so sweet, why is man what we ever find him to be—the victim of a continual unrest? "All things are full of labour . . . . The eye is not satisfied with seeing nor the ear with hearing" (Eccl. i. 8.) Our text supplies the answer: "All that cometh is vanity." Nor is the explanation of this state of things far to seek. For,

II. *God has made man for Himself.* Man however has deliberately chosen God's gifts rather than God Himself, and the law of vanity has passed upon all creation. "The creature was made subject to vanity." (See Rom. viii. 20, 21.) Here, I say, is the explanation of the present state of the world and of man. Our first parents saw the world beautiful and perfect, and they grasped at it for themselves. But the forbidden fruit turned to ashes in their mouths, and the world to them changed to chaos again. And ever since has sinful man been seeking in the world of sense what only he can find in the sphere of faith and spiritual communion. Ever since he has been loving the creature more than the Creator, and proving by bitter experience that the quest and enjoyment of the world apart from God is void and vain. "Happiness," says a pious author, "is the desire of every creature, yet, alas, how few obtain it here. Grant him but the desire of to-day and man anticipates felicity; he obtains his desire and yet he is not happy. Days and years are spent in the chase of bubbles which elude the grasp, or if caught yield only successive disappointments, and confirm the truth of the warning voice that 'all is vanity'; for earthly happiness is but a shadow, and as a shadow it vanishes."*

"All that cometh is vanity." Trust not therefore in that which can so easily fly away. Young man, who art living apart from God, thy strength of manhood will be vanity. Man of business, whose soul is centred in earthly gains, thy substance is a shadow, thy life is vanity. Votaries of pleasure who are ever crying for delights of the world and know not the inward satisfaction of a mind at peace with God, vanity is your lot by the Divine decree. Yea, of all estates and conditions of men who are seeking their portion in this world, is it true that their experience, at least in the end, is vanity and vexation of spirit. Their foundation is upon the flood-tide of death which at any moment may carry them away. Their glorious beauty is but a fading flower, yea, their root is as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as the dust. For God has imposed a law upon our spiritual nature as fixed and as certain as the law by which the sparks fly upward from the anvil or the law which keeps the planets in their course. God has made us for Himself, and we are like the dispossessed demon walking in dry places seeking rest and finding none, until we return unto Him who healeth the broken-hearted and giveth the weary rest.

> "Attempt how monstrous and how surely vain
> With aught but moral excellence, truth and love,
> With aught of earthly sort, with aught but God,
> To satisfy and fill the immortal soul.
> Attempt vain inconceivably—attempt
> To satisfy the ocean with a drop;
> To marry immortality to death;
> And with the unsubstantial shade of time
> To fill the embrace of all eternity!"*

As we have seen (1) God made the world for man's enjoyment; (2) the world was to be enjoyed in God and for God, because God made man for Himself. Man however has by sin wandered from God and has sought in the creature what can only be found in the Creator. Nevertheless, God has proved the glory of His grace by restoring man and bringing him back in Christ to a higher estate than that which he lost. Let us now briefly consider this blessed restoration.

III. *God through the darkness brings men the light of life.* "Remember the days of darkness" is the precept of the text. To ignore the facts of our existence is childish folly. To put away all thought of death is to repeat the conduct of the ostrich which, they say, hides its head in the sand to escape its pursuers. Yet multitudes every day are doing the same thing "frolicking on eternity's brink unapprehensive, when for aught they know the very next swollen surge may sweep them in." On the other hand there is the highest wisdom in remembering the days of darkness and in seeking a light for the shades of death. Such is the parting counsel of Israel's great Lawgiver. "O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end!" (Deut. xxxii. 29.) Watch yon mountaineer as with steady persevering step he climbs some Alpine peak that will set him near the sky. Cloud on cloud rolls above his head, and anon he enters the vaporous shroud. But onward and upward he presses until he stands high above cloud and shadow in the unveiled glory of the sunlit heaven. So likewise the man of God, the follower of Jesus, passes through the darkness of sorrow and death and sin to the perfect day of the presence and glory of God on high. "Remember the days of darkness." Trouble and sorrow and adversity are rightly described by this image. They are "the valley of the shadow of death" described by the Psalmist (Ps. xxiii. 4). Remember them with the humble consciousness of one who feels that

> "The path of sorrow, and that path alone,
> Leads to the land where sorrow is unknown."

* Dr. Burns' "Christian Philosophy."

* Pollok's "Course of Time."

Remember them, and think as you remember them, of the light which Christ's life has shed upon them. That life of blessedness which He lived has sanctified all suffering and sorrow, and the tears of those who bear their troubles in the spirit of Christ become gems in their crown. Until we see God's purpose in affliction it is a land of darkness to us like Egypt wrapt in sable gloom. But when we perceive that by losses and crosses Jehovah draws His people off from the creature to the Creator, from man to God, from earthly selfishness to heavenly love, we pass into the land of Goshen and behold the light of life.

"Remember the days of darkness," even the days of death, when with reluctant spirit man bows before the king of terrors. Contemplate the solemn scenes described in the beautiful imagery of the following chapter (Eccl. xii.), and anticipate for yourselves the palsied arm, the tottering step, the dim eye, the deaf ear, the hoary head, the exhausted nervous system, the ruptured heart, the inevitable lapse of life, and the long, long home of the tomb. In the steadfast confidence of faith ask death where is his sting and the grave where is his victory, and the voice divine by the great Apostle shall make the answer of peace, "Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. xv. 57). Believing in Him and abiding in Him you will die daily to self and sin, while the light of the eyes and the joy of nature will be increased and strengthened and multiplied in the vision of God. Your happiness will not depend upon the fleeting and fluctuating things of time, but will be centred in heaven and God, and death will be to you the gate to liberty and life and light eternal.

"Remember the days of darkness"—they are the days of the tyranny of sin. It is sin that hath clouded our life, deprvaed our nature, ruined mankind, and wrapt our world in darkness and death. But its days though many shall come to an end. And whilst in the spirit of true philosophy, as well as of humble repentance, we mourn sin's presence, we rejoice in the confident hope of the triumph of our King. For Christ day by day is gathering in His elect from all the world, and He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet, and sin and death are no more. Glorious consummation! "The light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold as the light of seven days, when the Lord bindeth up the breach of His people, and healeth the stroke of their wound" (Is. xxx. 26). Yea, that shall be a still more glorious consummation when God, according to His promise, shall make new heavens and a new earth wherein righteousness shall dwell for ever (2 Peter iii. 13).

THE Bishop of Manchester, at the opening of the Manchester Labour Home, promised £100 towards the working of the Church Army.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1892.

ST. JOHN'S FOUNDATION SCHOOL.

JUST at present the minds of all parents are full of the question of the education of their boys, the progress they are making, and the money it all costs. Young Hopeful has not yet been home long enough to make his immediate return to school a matter of paramount importance to the harassed household, regardless of any other consideration; his report is still under discussion, and his prospects are the subject of much anxious speculation.

It should never be forgotten by all who are not only interested in education generally, but are particularly concerned both in promoting it and in considering how to benefit by it, that the Church of England possesses an institution unique of its kind, a public school entirely without endowment, kept up from year to year by the offerings of loyal Churchmen all through the empire, to provide a free education for the sons of clergymen all the world over, without condition of any kind save only that there should be need of it, and a reasonable prospect of turning it to good account.

St. John's Foundation School was first established at Clapton some thirty years ago, and having outgrown its premises there was removed to Leatherhead, Surrey, where it now forms a noble pile of buildings, occupying a fine site on the highest point of land in the village, backed and flanked by broad fields and extensive woods. Its growth has been remarkable. The school now consists of upwards of 300 boys drawn from all quarters, filling two great quadrangles and occupying all the attention of a resident staff of about fifteen masters.

Out of this material, of all qualities and descriptions, it is pleasing to note that results are obtained

in no way inferior to those boasted of by larger schools of more ancient fame and more liberal endowment. St. John's School has had more than its share of University scholarships and distinctions, it stands second among the schools of England for successes obtained in the Oxford and Cambridge Board examination for certificates, and has established a record for distinctions gained in the examinations held at local centres by the University of Cambridge.

But perhaps the greatest honour of St. John's School is that it is constituted to be a pure Church school. Religious teaching in the principles of the Church of England is a conspicuous and unalterable feature in its curriculum. In these days that is something to be thankful for. In many schools now religious teaching is openly disregarded or covertly shirked, in most it is not too much to say that all it consists of is a superficial study of a few pages of the Old and New Testaments, formed into text-books for the occasion, with special cram notes, and without an approach to inculcation of any special doctrine whatever, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments are disappearing from the ordinary school curriculum as completely as the Church Catechism. By the very constitution of St. John's School they will continue to be studied there as long as the school itself lasts.

The education at St. John's is for the most part and for some time was entirely gratuitous. Some time ago the present headmaster, the Rev. A. F. Rutty, M.A., suggested that its usefulness might be extended, if, in addition to those boys admitted on the foundation to gratuitous education, non-foundationers were also admitted, at scales of fees regulated so as to benefit all persons, especially clergymen who did not come under the conditions of the foundation, and who yet might appreciate the advantages offered. This has been done with the happiest results, and St. John's Foundation School is now open to all those who, at a moderate fee, desire for their sons a really first-rate public school education with the further advantage of having that education loyally carried out in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England.

OVER THE TRACES.

NONCONFORMISTS notably object to our parochial system. "Oh," they say, "we think the fixed life tenure of the beneficed clergy is radically wrong." But surely this evil, if it be one, is greatly modified by the constant flittings of the curates from parish to parish, and especially from one large centre of population to another. Besides, we live in such an atmosphere of change that a ten years' vicariate is very much the exception, be the more immediate causes what they may. The curates are for the most part young and often high-spirited, and it is a great misfortune for a man who has any *go* and force of character to be set down in a badly organised parish where, though there is endless opportunity for work, everything is snubbed or thwarted outside a certain hard and fast line laid down by a narrow-minded or self-opinionated vicar. The inevitable result is a kick over the traces. Young blood is hot, and if you would break in the fiery steed you must let him go his own pace while you guide his head, and do not allow him to stop till his strength is well-nigh spent. We know of one instance (out of many) where a useful and active man found the restraints of exclusive orthodoxy all too straight for him, and so set up a "Hall" for himself under the shadow of the grand old steeple of his parish church. He was, like the "Eagle" pen, ever-flowing as journalist, writer, and lecturer to young men; but he had *his* faults, and so had the vicar. To treat all your curates as if they were formed in one and the same mould, like your crested teaspoons, is bad policy for vicar or for bishop. We humbly suggest that a diocesan official might be appointed whose duty it should be to go round, see what each curate is best fitted for, and either arrange for his work with the vicar, or transplant him to more congenial soil. Much friction would thus be avoided and the right man be more often found in the right place than he is. But put it whichever way you please, more must depend upon the tact and good sense of the vicar than anything else. One fatal error in our ecclesiastical superiors of every grade is *craze mania*. Said a certain poor parson of his diocesan: "He is my bishop, it is true; but he is as human as I am, and I may say without disrespect that I have had painful experience of his pet crazes. I should have been sorry to have been his curate, for he treats his clergy as if their time and their reading were his own special prerogative. He began his episcopal career by telling us what books to read and how long to devote to them. He received me on my first visit with two fingers and a thumb (not *seen*), and in his fussy little way said, 'Well, Mr. ———, what is it? Your time and mine are both precious. My ordination candidates are waiting, and your train goes at one o'clock.' In ten minutes he dismissed me without the offer of even a biscuit, though I had come fifty miles through the snow. The last time I wrote was to ask his leave to resign my living in three months' time, mentioning by the way that I was going to sell my books. 'Books,' he wrote, 'can be sold in a fortnight.' Poor bishop! He certainly has time and books on his brain!" How many unfortunate curates are driven wild by some craze of their vicar, be it reading, schools, clerical attire, or what not? Crazes may be very good things in their proper sphere; but let every man ride his own hobby to market, not mount on it a novice, who ten to one will be thrown before he gets there.

We agree with Canon Crosthwaite and the sermon we publish to-day, that the Purity Society craze is a great blunder, since the family circle is the best discipline, if only the parents have sense enough to win the early confidence of their children, and thus encourage modesty and chastity in their noblest forms, in order to prevent the passions getting the upper hand, and kicking over the traces.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"IS THERE A PURGATORY?"

SIR,—"J. B." says, in the PULPIT of the 19th inst., that my letter of the 12th inst. was "very rude;" yet he does not point out the particular expressions which he considers offensive, so that I am unable either to correct or retract them. I am sure I meant no rudeness. But perhaps he regards my whole letter as rude? It may be that he considers it rude on my part to state an opinion at all in opposition to his? Or that it was rude to point out the flaws in the mental procedure by which he sought to raise his opinion in public estimation? Fidelity to my argument compels me on some occasions to speak plainly; perhaps he regards this as "rudeness"? However, as I was studious of brevity in that letter, it may be that I did not state my meaning as clearly as I otherwise would have done; would you therefore kindly permit me to go over again the salient points of the case, in order, if possible, to find out where the rudeness is.

In his letter in the PULPIT of the 28th ult., in order to prove his notion of universal restoration, he quoted Jerome as saying that, "With God no rational creature perishes eternally." To this I replied that this quotation would not prove his point, unless he regarded the word "eternally" as meaning *endlessly*, which would be directly opposite to what he regards as its proper meaning. And then I was driven to choose between two possible conclusions: either that "J. B." understood the word to be used in that sense by Jerome, or that he had not a proper perception of the import of the proposition. To make it appear still more plainly that the word meant endlessly, I said let us substitute in the quotation the only other possible meaning that it can have, which is that of a *limited period*, and then the sentence will run thus: "With God no rational creature perishes for a limited period of time;" then, if this be true (and I am only interpreting Jerome's words by the meaning which "J. B." says should be put to them), it is impossible to avoid drawing the conclusion that the perishing will be an *endless* one. This, of course, is in flat contradiction to what he wished to prove by the quotation. "The head and front of my offending," in my last letter, was that I thus tried to draw attention to the uncomfortable position in which he had placed himself. I did so in the hope that by a reasonable process he would be able to extricate himself from it. But my well-intentioned efforts have been called "rudeness." However, in the hope that I shall find pardon at your hands if in anything I have offended, I proceed to show that those brotherly efforts appear to have been made in vain, because in his last letter of the 19th inst. he commits the same piece of folly. He quotes Jerome again as saying "that God pities his creatures, and will not suffer those whom He Himself has formed to perish eternally," and then goes on to add that this passage (with others which he also quotes) teaches universal "restoration." I reply that it does, if the word "eternally" means *endlessly*. Then I wish to know why "J. B." uses the word in that sense, since on other similar occasions he refuses to do it? And if he says that that is not the meaning of the word in the quotation, then further I wish to know why he quotes an author whose words are used in a sense directly opposed to his own? This is a piece of conduct which I find it hard on any rational ground to explain. Without wishing to be "rude" towards him, I must further add that he does not seem to understand the Bishop of Manchester's language, who says, in the quotation which he gives from his book, that 'unto the æons of æons means endlessness." "J. B." does not see how completely he gives himself away here, because this is just what I am contending for.

I have only to substitute this interpretation of the Bishop in Rev. xiv. 11 to bring out the doctrine which I am upholding, "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for æons and æons," that is, *endlessly*. I rather think "J. B." has no escape from this.

Mr. Murphy's attenuated "probability" won't suit. He says, "It is obvious that if 'eternal times' means times that have ended, 'eternal punishment' does not necessarily mean 'endless' punishment." To test the validity of this reasoning let us substitute in this statement for "eternal punishment" the phrase "eternal life," taken from the same verse in Matt. xxv. 46, then it will read thus: If "eternal times" means times that have ended, "eternal life" does not necessarily mean "endless life"! That is to say, that final annihilation of human souls is the goal to which Mr. Murphy's logic and interpretation of Scripture tend. It is very difficult then to see how he can consistently advocate "final restoration."

But his reasoning has a worse result than this. He got the phrase "eternal times" in Romans xvi. 25; it seems truly marvellous that he did not notice in the next verse the phrase "eternal God," and that he did not try by a comparison of the two to make a *consistent* interpretation. If we substitute "eternal God" for "eternal punishment" in the formula mentioned above, it will read thus: "It is obvious that if 'eternal times' means times that have ended, 'eternal God' does not necessarily mean an 'endless God'"!

If the reasoning that leads to such results as these pleases Mr. Murphy, he is welcome to it, at least so far as I am concerned; but then I would hope that he is not so sanguine as to expect that other people will have anything to do with it.

December 22nd, 1891. R. DONALDSON.

SIR,—When I wrote the letter that you published on the 19th of the present month, I had forgotten that Dr. Moorhouse, the Bishop of Manchester, also translates κόλασις, in the 27th chapter of Matthew, by *chastisement* in preference to *punishment*. See his work "The Teaching of Christ" (Macmillan, 1891), page 139, *et seq.* All the five discourses which make up the book are well worth reading, especially the third and fourth.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, December 28th, 1891.

PRESBYTERIAN ORDERS DISALLOWED

SIR,—It ought to have been unnecessary for me to write to you again on the legality of Presbyterial orders in the Church of England in the Reformation times. I decline to accept as a precedent a case quoted not from the books, but from a newspaper. I have referred to Strype's "Whitgift" to Archdeacon Hook's life of him, and to several other sources of information, without finding the case of Frazer alluded to indirectly by your correspondent. Probably it is a case, but inapplicable. Let your correspondent quote a case from the books including Burns' "Ecclesiastical Law." He cannot. What I say is absolutely correct as matter of law. Ministers of Presbyterial orders were competent from 1559 till 1662 to hold benefices in this country. By 13 Eliz. c. 12 this became a matter of actual enactment, that Act being both retrospective and prospective.

Primate Bramhall's action is misstated by your correspondent. He refused to pronounce on the question of the validity of Presbyterian orders, and frightened the presbyterially ordained incumbents of Ulster by asking them how they proposed to recover their tithes. The majority submitted and accepted Episcopal orders, but fifty-nine refused, and he ejected them. This is matter of historical fact, although it is true that Ware does not mention the ejections. Some of those ejected, in the diocese of Dromore, were afterwards readmitted. Vide "Life of Bramhall," prefixed to his works, edition 1676, Dublin; vide also Dean Murray's "Irish Church History"; vide also sundry contemporary authorities.

It was easier for an Irish bishop to act in such cases as Bramhall did, in troubled times, than for an English bishop, because the provisions of 13 Eliz. c. 12 were not (as I believe, I have not access to the Statutes) enacted in Ireland. But this does not make the Irish Primate's action legal.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

THE Archbishop of York will summon Convocation to meet for business on Tuesday, February 23rd, 1892.

THE Bishop of Bombay has been recalled suddenly to India by the illness of one of his children, and left England on Thursday, the 24th ult.

THE *Manchester Guardian* learns that, according to letters received the Rev. Cecil Hook has derived considerable benefit from his visit to Cairo, where he proposes stopping for a time.

THE Bishop of Liverpool has appointed Mr. Richard Farmer, solicitor, who has been some time deputy-registrar of the diocese of Liverpool, to be joint registrar of the diocese with Mr. John Gamon, who has hitherto been sole registrar.

THE *Durham County Advertiser* announces that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England are about to take over the manorial business in connection with the estates of the see into their more direct control, by placing it in charge of their secretary and other officers of their staff.

CANON EAGAR, rector of Ashton-under-Lyne, and Rural Dean, celebrated his jubilee as a clergyman of the English Church on the 19th ult., having been ordained by Archbishop Howley at Advent 1841. During his ministry the rebuilding of the tower of Ashton Parish Church and the restoration of the fabric generally has been accomplished at a cost not under £13,000.

THROUGH the great liberality of a few gentlemen interested in the diocese of Wakefield, the extra piece of ground adjoining the site for the Bishop's house, which is a most desirable addition for the sake of privacy, has been purchased, and will be immediately conveyed to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

AT a meeting of the Council of the East London Church Fund last week, Prebendary How, vicar of Bromley, presiding, the finance committee reported that the receipts up to the 18th ult. were £14,784, being £1,473 less than at the corresponding date last year, and that the grants due on December 31st would almost entirely exhaust the balance at the bankers. It was resolved to report to the Bishop that in consequence of the state of the finances the council must recommend that certain pressing applications be deferred.

ON Thursday, 24th ult. a deputation, representing a body of subscribers representative of all shades of opinion in Birmingham, presented the Bishop of Coventry (Dr. Bowlby) with a cheque for 200 guineas and an illuminated address in recognition of his services in connection with educational, philanthropic, and temperance work in the city during the past seventeen years. In acknowledgment the Bishop said he looked forward to seeing soon a young, energetic, and earnest Bishop, like Fraser of Manchester, or How of Wakefield, in charge of the see of Birmingham, and would gladly relinquish his rectory of St. Philip's as the Episcopal residence.

IT appears from the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* for January that the committee of the C.M.S. have now definitely stated that they see no prospect at the present time of undertaking the responsibility of sending a steamer up to the Victoria Lake, being convinced that the difficulties must involve an expenditure and a risk of failure, which, in their judgment, the comparative advantages of a steamer over a sailing boat for the society's purposes would not warrant their undertaking. The committee's views, it is added, have been courteously met by the holders of the fund contributed for a steamer, the proprietors of the *Record* having publicly stated their willingness to hand the money to the committee, if the donors consent, when satisfactory terms shall have been made by the committee with the Imperial British East Africa Company to secure to the society such use of their steamer as may be required after it has been placed on the lake.

LAST week a well-attended meeting of managers and friends of Church schools in the Rural Deanery of Bradford was held at the Bradford Church Institute, for the purpose of considering the best means to be taken to preserve the schools under the altered conditions of public elementary education. The Bishop of Ripon presided. Canon Bardsley, vicar of Bradford, in moving a resolution appealing for liberal assistance to the Bradford Church of England School Society, said that the object of the meeting was to take steps to secure at least £2,000 or £3,000 in donations, and he hoped £600 or £700 in annual subscriptions. The resolution was agreed to, and also propositions for the affiliation of the schools in the rural deanery to the society, and in favour of interim payments in respect of the grant in aid at the same time as the payments of the fee grant. The Bishop of Ripon, in closing

the meeting, said he had been very anxious, in regard to the great educational question which had been thrust upon them during the last year, that there should be a strong and determined desire on the part of Church people to act in unison. He had felt that the one enemy against them on the question was the divided counsels which were likely to obtain. He admitted that in the face of the new Act the clergy were face to face with new difficulties, and he for one was not going to undervalue those difficulties. But he would deprecate what he would call parochialism of feeling in the matter. There were two dangers ahead, one of which rose from religious feeling itself. They should not forget that they were bound to educate children in the ordinary education of life, as well as to train them in what they believed to be the higher conditions of the soul. It had also become more and more important that they should maintain religious teaching by virtue of the fact that there was a certain movement a-foot on the part of those who declared themselves to be Christian teachers. Church of England clergymen were desiring to secularise, root and branch, the whole education of this country.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS

Batty, Rev. William Edmund, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Fulham ; Rector of Finchley.
Bingley, Rev. J. T. ; Chaplain of Highgate Cemetery.
Blundell, Rev. C. J. P., M.A., Rector of Alderton-with-Grafton Regis ; Vicar of Whittlebury, Northamptonshire.
Bonney, Rev. Alfred, M.A. ; Vicar of Buildwas, Iron Bridge, Salop.
Brown, Rev. John G., Curate of Christ Church, Pendlebury ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's Mission Church, Hulme.
Courtenay, Rev. George Frederick, M.A. ; Vicar of Temple Bruer, Grantham.
Davies, Rev. Evan, late Vicar of Llangennech ; Vicar of Cwmammam, Carmarthenshire.
De la Hey, Rev. Richard O., M.A., Vicar of St. Martin's, Low Marple, Cheshire ; Rector of St. Bartholomew's, Bathealton, Wellington, Somerset.
Fitch, Rev. T. W., M.A. ; Vicar of Lullington, Sussex.
Fraser, Rev. George Houlton, Curate of Wigston Magna, Leicester ; Vicar of Owslebury, Winchester.
Godfrey, Rev. Edward, M.A. ; Vicar of Great Tey, Essex.
Gray, Rev. Andrew E. P., M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Wallasey ; Lecturer at St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead.
Gray, Rev. Arthur Wollaston, M.A. ; Vicar of Rushmere St. Andrew, Suffolk.
Griffiths, Rev. Thomas Turner, M.A., Chaplain ; Naval Instructor in her Majesty's Fleet.
Hollingsworth, Rev. Henry, M.A. ; Vicar of East Molesey, Surrey.
Hooppell, Rev. J. L. E., Curate of Kentish Town ; Domestic Chaplain to the Baroness Lamington.
Jones, Rev. Maurice, B.A. ; Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.
Little, Rev. Robert Bilby ; Vicar of Standon, Ware.
Lund, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of St. Peter's, Chorley, Lancashire ; Chaplain to Chorley Union Workhouse.
Mansell, Rev. Henry ; Chaplain of Nottingham Goal.
Melville, Rev. David Melvill ; Vicar of Market Rasen, Lincolnshire.
Mills, Rev. Henry, M.A. ; Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Southall.
Molony, Rev. J., B.A., Diocesan Chaplain, Glasgow and Galloway ; Rector of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Moffat, N.B.
Munday, Rev. John George, M.A. ; Vicar of Clee-cum-Cleethorpes, Lincolnshire.
Nash, Rev. Percy A., M.A. ; Association Secretary to the Missions to Seamen for the West Midland Counties and Wales.
Nihill, Rev. H. D. ; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of London.
Odell, Rev. Francis J. ; Chaplain to the *Severn*.
Ohlson, Rev. George, Bac.-ès-Lettres (Univ. of France), and A.K.C. (Lond.), Assistant-Curate of All Saints', Eastbourne ; Vicar of Bishop's Sutton, Alresford, Hants.
Osborne, Rev. James, B.A. ; Rector of Holton-cum-Beckering, Lincolnshire.
Owen, Rev. P. H., Vicar of Owslebury ; Vicar of Colden Common, Winchester.
Pearce, Rev. Stephen Spencer, M.A. ; Perpetual Curate of Long Combe, Oxon.
Penny, Rev. Robert G., M.A., Rector of Warbleton, near Hawkhurst, Sussex ; Vicar of St. Paul's, King's Cross, Halifax.
Perrin, Rev. W. E. ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Martin's, Leeds.
Pollock, Rev. Bertram, M.A. ; Public Preacher in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Ponsonby, Rev. F. J., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene, Munster-square ; Warden to the Community of St. Katherine, Fulham.
Pulling, Rev. Edward Herbert ; Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.
Robberds, Rev. Walter John Forbes, Assistant-Curate of St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol ; Chaplain of Cuddesdon College.
Roe, Rev. Wilfrid Thomas, M.A. ; Chaplain of Sherborne Union, Dorset.
Rosenthal, Rev. M. ; East London Clergyman.
Seddon, Rev. William Herbert, M.A. ; Minister of the Chapel of St. Mary, Hatfield.
Simpson, Rev. Joseph, Rector of Castleford ; Rector of Wadingham, Lincolnshire.
Smith, Rev. R. Gardner, Rector of Wadingham, Lincolnshire ; Rector of Castleford, Yorkshire.
Smyth, Rev. J. B. ; Chaplain to the *Belleisle*.
Snepp, Rev. Edward, Vicar of St. Paul's, King Cross, Halifax ; Vicar of Burstow, near Horley, Kent.
Sorby, Rev. J. A., M.A. ; Curate of All Saints', Bradford, with a Special Charge of the Bramley-street Mission Church.
Thornewell, Rev. Charles Francis, M.A., Vicar of Burton-on-Trent ; Vicar of Bakewell, Derbyshire.
Trevor, Rev. Thomas Warren, M.A., Rector of Machynlleth ; Prebendary of Penmynydd and Canon non-residentiary of Bangor Cathedral.
Trehearne, Rev. George H. ; Chaplain to the *Invincible*.
Trotter, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of St. Stephen's, Trinidad ; Vicar-General of the Diocese.
Walker, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of Abbot's Morton ; Rural Dean of Fakenham (diocese of Worcester).
Wallis, Rev. Frederick Alfred ; Rector of Springthorpe, Lincolnshire.
Williams, Rev. Griffiths, B.A. ; Rector of Llangynog.
Wilson, Rev. Herbert, M.A. ; Rector of Mulbarton, Norfolk.
Wright, Rev. Thomas Russell, M.A. ; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Whish, Rev. J. F. M., M.A., Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Birmingham ; Vicar of Blackford, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset.
Yonge, Rev. Charles Burell, M.A., Rector of Newton Ferrers, Devonshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Adams, Rev. Coker, M.A., Rector of Saham Tovey, and late Fellow of New College, Oxford, at Saham Rectory, on the 27th ult., aged 65.
Brooke, Rev. Edward Perry, M.A., Precentor of Dromore, formerly Captain 62nd Regiment, at Rostrevor, on the 21st ult., aged 92.
Egar, Rev. W. J., Rector of the parish, at Geldeston Rectory, Beccles, on the 17th ult., aged 55.
Miller, Rev. George Dempster, M.A., for many years Vicar of Woodkirk, near Leeds, at Cheltenham, on the 13th ult.
Nunneley, Rev. F. B., late Vicar of Weston-under-Weatherley and Wappenbury, at Leamington, on the 25th ult.
Power, Rev. J. P., Rector of the parish, at Goadby Marwood Rectory, on the 18th ult., aged 72.
Sykes, Rev. Edward John, at Basildon Vicarage, Reading, on the 24th ult., aged 63.
Thompson, Rev. Charles, formerly Vicar of South Myms, at 10, Upper Addison-gardens, W., on the 21st ult., in his 80th year.
Tombe, Rev. Henry Joy, Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, at Hollywood House, Glenealy, county Wicklow, on the 22nd ult.
Williams, Rev. Henry, Vicar of North Nibley, Gloucestershire, on the 21st ult,

The Church of England Pulpit.

MISSED OPPORTUNITIES.

By the Lord Bishop of RIPON.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey, on Sunday Evening, July 19th, 1891.

"Then I knew that this was the word of the Lord."—Jer. xxxii. 8.

WE have often heard it said that time is no agent; but, if time be no agent, certainly time is a revealer of secrets; and it is a revealer of secrets which very often rebukes alike the rashness and also the dulness of our lives. We have only to remember that time, bringing to light "the hidden things of darkness," reveals, not only those things which the wickedness of man would fain keep secret, but also those disastrous mistakes which have arisen out of the weakness of men, and which have been the result of their dulness of apprehension. No person who understands, and still less he who values, life as a sacred and inalienable opportunity of doing something for the world before he dies, but has often wished that he could overleap the bounds of the present and understand what the result of his action shall be, so that, with the larger experience of the future, he might go the better armed against the perplexing problems and conditions of duty which beset him in the present. If only we had the education which will come in the future, how we should be protected against the mistakes of the present! And thus we feel a certain impatience against time. We know that time lies in wait to expose before long the blunders which we have made, and we only wish that we could so forestall time with the possession of a larger prudence as to prevent the future getting the opportunity of declaring "Thus you acted, and thus you failed: if with more prudence you had acted otherwise, thus and thus would have been the brilliance of your success."

Now, I would ask you to notice that the incident connected with the words that I have read, and which is recorded in the chapter read as the lesson for this evening's service, suggests to us exactly that thought of the way in which time may rebuke our rashness and rebuke also our dulness. The incident which is recorded is a very simple one, but it is suggestive and significant. A cousin of the prophet's was the owner of certain land which lay outside the city. The city at that time was beleaguered by the Babylonish armies. Many of the inhabitants of Jerusalem were pressed probably for want of money, because the bitterness of the seige and the length of the war had exhausted their resources; and many more there were who were ready enough to part with such property as they possessed for any price which a purchaser might offer, when the very land and property which they owned was already swallowed up, so to speak, by the invading hosts. A certain sort of dream, as we might call it, passed through the mind of Jeremiah, then in close imprisonment because of the jealous anger of the king. Whatever else he was, he was a Jew at heart, and he had that capacity which was singularly, I suppose, possessed by the Jew—the tenacious love of the soil which gave him birth. It was a joy for him to think that the land which was given by God to his forefathers belonged in succession of family inheritance to his own kinsmen of that day; and the dream crossed his mind that perchance that moment might come when he would have the opportunity of becoming the possessor of his ancestral heritage. That was his thought. It came to him as a dream; he describes it afterwards as the direction of the word of the Lord coming to him. But it was not, I imagine, realised as the word of God at the first moment of its approach: it was only a later circumstance—an actual incident which occurred in his life—which enabled him to see that the first suggested thought was, indeed, the word of the Lord. For he had thought of it, and a while afterwards his cousin Hanameel came with the absolute proposal on his lips that Jeremiah should purchase the family property in Anathoth. Then when he saw fulfilled in fact the very thought which had passed through his mind, when that which he had dreamed of had become a realised possibility in his life—"then," he said, "I knew that this was the word of the Lord." In other words, it was only the light of after circumstances which flashed upon his mind the significance of the early suggestion. He might have left it as a mere suggestion, he might have lived his life, as many of us have lived our lives, with the possession of a dream which we never for a moment imagined could possibly be realised. But here at his very door, here at the gate of the prison, is the very man of whom he dreamed coming and making to him the offer which he dreamed. Then he said, "When, thus translated into fact, my dream came before me once more, I knew that it was the word of the Lord."

Now, the first thought which naturally arises from a thing like that is this. We may act upon our first impressions, our impressions may be very strong, and they may be ready to link themselves with our natural ambitions, but it is not every impression that is the word of light, still less the word of the Lord. Religion divides itself very often, if we were to classify it, into two kinds, or two families or types. It has often been made the

subject of mere mental impressions. The presence of the Spirit, the consciousness of a spirit working within, that has been emphasised to such a degree that at last men, driven by their impulse or suggestion of some passing impression, have committed deeds of violence and wrong which the common conscience of humanity condemns. That is to say, early impressions, strong impressions, even impressions which jump with the spirit of what we believe to be right, impressions which wed themselves to our darling dreams, however much they may justify themselves by the exercise of our imaginative conscience, are not in themselves to be accepted as truly Divine suggestions. We must wait for the light of other circumstances. This is exactly that balance which protects us from what I may call the fanaticism of faith, and turns our faith into the faith of a living prudence. If every suggestion which passes through the mind of men, however splendid it might be, however it might dazzle their fancy, was therefore, because it was splendid and because it was congenial, exactly to be followed, we should have the confusion of the world worse confounded, and disorder would march behind the advancing ranks of religion. No; subjective impressions must be verified by outward opportunities. If a man thinks that he is called of God to do this thing or the other, it is wise that he should distrust his own impression till he sees the providential circumstances in his life so open as to be the seconding call of providence emphasising the original suggestion within. Authority in religion is never on the one side or the other; authority is never wholly within, nor yet wholly without. If it is wholly within, it is open to the declaration of being a mere subjective impression; if it is wholly without, it lays no weight upon the spiritual nature of man, and receives no response from his conscience. But, when there comes to us this which, on the one hand, links itself with our inner nature, and by its own commanding presence makes us feel that it is true, and brings to it also the verifying evidence of providential opportunity – then duty leaps up and can draw her sword, because she knows that she is not the victim of a passing impression alone, but that two things, the law without and the law within, have been combining within his life—then he may know that this also is the word of the Lord.

But if, on the one side, an accident like this may be taken to rebuke the rash impulsiveness of men who would act upon their own subjective impressions, it also, and I think still more strikingly, witnesses against our dulness, which fails to perceive the true significance of the incidents of life as they occur. It was an impression on Jeremiah's mind, and it was only afterwards, when the light of that later circumstance of Hanameel's visit occurred, that he perceived its full significance. "Then I knew that this was the word of the Lord.', Now mark that this experience is very true in our ordinary life. How often it happens that we have failed to realise the full value of our opportunities till later circumstances flash new light on their meaning! To take the simplest illustration which might come to our minds, you are in the midst of a crowd; you are anxiously looking out because it is a crowd where many of the celebrities of life are gathered; and after you have passed some one suddenly says to you, "Did you see him?" and immediately there flashes upon you the thought, you have been close to one whose name you have heard, whose works perchance you have read, of whom you have had the greatest desire to have some knowledge. Just then the after circumstance of the utterance of your friend flashes upon you the true meaning of this: you have been close to that greatness which you have worshipped, you have missed the opportunity. Or there are incidents in your own life. Have you never had some friend who in early life was your familiar companion? You played with him, studied the same tasks with him; and now life has diverged, and he has risen to greatness, and we remain where we were on the commonplace level of life. People meet us and say, "You knew him; tell me some incidents of his early life." But now the dimness of the past comes upon your memory, and all the anecdotes have dropped away; the multitude of other affairs has obscured your recollection. But then, by the light of this after greatness, you know you have been by the side of one who was possessed of conspicuous genius, one of whom you would say, "Would that I had husbanded those stories of the past; would that I had observed him, for his life would have a further meaning to me had I been one who had noted carefully the characteristics, the features of his talent, of his life." In other words, later circumstances are constantiy forcing upon us the dulness with which we have confronted the incidents of life as they have occurred. And surely that is the common witness of history. What is the history of all human progress? What is the history of literary life? Not in our lives only is it true that it is the later events which flash upon us the true meaning and significance of things. The great mass of mankind have failed to recognise the greatness among them, the opportunities amongst them, till the world has discovered the greatness; and then our recollection is forced reluctantly and remorsefully back into the past, and we say, "Would we had observed it and cherished it!" "Who killed John Keats?" has often been asked. To the men of his day he was but a raw youth, full of a kind of rude desire for poetic fame; but now we recognise the genius which lay there; we go back and say how true it is that the men of their day failed to recognise the glory of these men, have persecuted them, and let them starve, and afterwards have built their monuments. Butler shall live, and toil,

and starve, but we shall give him a stone when he has needed bread. Later circumstances reveal to us the dulness which fails to recognise the opportunities of life.

And, if it is true with regard to men of letters, it is also true with regard to leaders of great movements. We are often disposed to imagine, because we recognise the greatness of great names of the past, therefore the men of their day were far more to blame than we are in that they did not recognise them; but we may be doing exactly the same thing ourselves. The men were not labelled and known as great in their day. Anybody can recognise greatness when it is pointed out to him and explained; anybody can understand a duty when he sees that the whole world is openly enthusiastic in the doing of it. After all what we want is the spirit that can perceive before others do it, while we ourselves have the opportunity—the spirit which can perceive the opportunity which is at our door. Moses was not great to the men of his day. He was but the interloper, busybodying himself about things with which he had no concern—"Who made thee a ruler and a judge?"—and yet we say that this man whom they reject is the lawgiver, is the emphasised lawgiver in the history of Israel.

And it is the same in the Christian age. We talk of "the great Athanasius," but he is great now because later ages have discovered his greatness. But to the men of his day he was only as a little pestilent fellow, who would be insisting on his own way of thought, a troubler of the Israel of his day, a man of whom they would say, "Let us get rid of him, if we can." We say, "How dull these men were not to see the mightiness of the mighty Athanasius!" Later developments of life, later and larger growths of means of thought, have shed light upon the man, and now we see how great he was. They missed him, the men of that day!

It is the same in the history of our Lord. You are not surprised that the same thing should be fulfilled in His life who was in all points as we are—tempted, yet without sin. The experience with which Christ's life is charged is precisely the same: they saw no beauty in Him. We say, "If we had lived in those days our hand would not have been lifted up against that sacred life, we should have torn the crown of thorns from His brow, we should have welcomed His mission, we should have adored Him, we should have worshipped His feet." But the men of that day did not see the beauty that they should desire Him. "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil," were the words with which He was greeted. John the Baptist pointed out their dulness—"There standeth One among you whom ye know not"; and though the Baptist was unworthy to loose His shoes from His feet, He moved among them. He was but the Man of Sorrows, and He was the Galilean Teacher, who at best had power to sway the ignorant crowd, and they took Him with cruel hands and hanged Him on the cross. But we forget that this may be true in us. Even in our midst Christ stands, and we fail to recognise Him. How often there has been the dream that He might live, and go in and out amongst us; but we should say, "Yet there is nothing very remarkable in this Man. He does not impress us as having more than the ordinary power—not greater spiritual force, perchance." And we might, indeed, not crucify Him and slay Him; we might accept Him as the lion of a season, and set at naught His counsels, and refuse His commands.

Why is it we are perpetually visiting with our severe criticism the dulness of the past, when we may be dull ourselves—dull to duty, dull to opportunity, dull to the meaning of the age in which we are living, dull to the very call of God, dull to the presence of Christ. Every duty, every opportunity of kindness, every incident of our life, if we are alive to see it in its brighter light, in its true significance, would never be deemed to be trivial and insignificant at all. It is because we are dull that we say, "This is of no matter, this is of no moment." We elbow our way through the crowd of life, roughly heedless of our brother men, scarcely stopping to think whether we have put our brother to inconvenience; we thrust ourselves between him and the sight which his eyes are longing to see; we may have been obscuring heaven's light from him. We do not see that these things, these dull incidents, these trivial commonplace events, may be, in the light of some larger future, charged with a deep meaning; and our sense of responsibility will leap up when we realise that what we refused, what we turned away from and rejected, was not a commonplace incident, but a Divine call, the presence of a noble and Heaven-given opportunity. Only the sale of a bit of land, and yet it was the word of the Lord! Only a duty which you should have done yesterday, only the effort to deal liberally by the appeal which is made to you to-day, only the determination to master the meaning of some social question in order that you may clearly understand your duty, only that you should try to grasp the situation of life and understand where your responsibilities lie! "Commonplace things these!" "Give us noble duties," you say, "that are charged with the presence of God. If God came and told us to do this thing, if the light of heaven fell upon it, and we saw it radiant with the smile of God, how eagerly we would do it!" But this is commonplace—the duty in the home; setting a higher example in the moral tone and conversation in the midst of society which may be losing its claim and grasp on moral ideas; these commonplace duties springing up in home life—we do not see their significance. When we begin to see light, when the light shall flash upon it, when the grave is opening upon us, this very flash of the circumstance which

we call death may shine so back upon the trivial incidents of our life, that we shall realise for the first time that those commonplace things, those duties which I shirked, those things from which I turned away, thinking them of no moment at all—those also were the word of the Lord.

May I, then, for a moment ask you to observe the application of that truth, that time reveals to us our dulness in relation to certain aspects of our life?

First, the circumstances of the *presence* of God. We are often disposed to say that our lot in the nineteenth century is cast in what we may call unfavourable circumstances for faith. Splendid miracles no longer happen. Who is amongst us to raise the dead? We have no Moses to cleave the Red Sea asunder. We have no vision of prophets in the fire, who mount up on chariots of flame and disappear in the open heaven. Give us these things. Yes, it is true we have changed. We do not live in an age of special and startling interventions of the Divine providence; but may we not for all that be living in an age in which the presence of the Lord, though no longer manifested by stately and striking manifestations, is calmly, persistently, daily, evidenced? The men who went through the wilderness ate of the bread which came down from heaven; they crossed the Jordan, and they ate of the corn of the land. Were they, do you think, unwise enough to say?—"When we had the manna, in the wilderness which descended before our eyes from heaven, we had the witness of the real presence of God amongst us; but now that we have crossed the Jordan we reap down the corn of the land which grew and which heathen hands have planted; we are no longer fed from heaven; the presence of God has disappeared." Would they not rather feel that the corn of the land was sweet to their taste, that now at last they were eating the natural crops of sweet earth which was God's earth still? Does the perpetuity of a blessing, the constancy of a blessing, make it less God's blessing?

Are we to await something that shall reveal that it is God indeed? May not the presence of God be as real amongst the ordinary conventional aspects of our daily life—in the sun that rises and sets, in the harvests that are sown and reaped, in life baptised in the presence of God, lived by His providence in the opportunities of daily duty—may not God be present in all these? And may it not be also that the hour might come upon us when the light from some new combination of circumstances might so flash upon our present or our past life as to reveal to us 'God was there indeed?" Many and many a man has lived, like the patriarch, in the belief that only within his own tented home where his pious father dwelt was the presence of God manifested, only where the home-altar was set would the Divine presence come to bless. But on the lone hill-side, with the bleak chalk ranges all about him, with heaven above his head set with the light of stars, there he can wake up, and the circumstances of life flash across him their true significance: "This which I thought the desert is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." Later circumstances may flash upon us this, that we who imagined that we were living in an age in which the presence of God was an unreality could at last discover, in a light which shall be an unchallenged revelation to our souls, that God has been "about our path and about our bed, and spying out all our ways."

Or take it with regard to what we may call the *providential circumstances of life.* Have you never felt that your burden in life is a larger one to bear than your neighbour's? Few amongst us have not had experience which has made us thirst to change our lot with that of others. We think that others who go cheerily through the world have less affliction than we; we wish we could change with them. But suppose—may I for a moment give you this one significant *if* as the hypothesis of my thought?—if the Lord Almighty did meet you, Who understands exactly the conditions of flesh and blood, Who knows those special conditions which you have inherited through the long succession of your ancestors, if He were to come to you and say: "I am about to bring upon you this sorrow—you will lose pecuniarily, or you shall have this illness, or that true one shall be swept from your side; I ask you to bear for My sake, My child, this burden; and if that measure your strength, I know exactly what you can bear; and I know also the sweet and the glorious bounty of grace which shall come to you in the bearing of it." Not one amongst us with the face of God's strength looking into ours, and the smile of God encouraging us to patience and fortitude, would ever bear to shrink from the burden; we would gird up the loins of our nature to bear whatever it was—sorrow, bereavment, loss. But that which we would do if God so spake to us is surely that which we might have the faith to do—seeing that later circumstances may just flash upon us this revelation—"It was God, indeed, who brought that burden upon me." That loss, that bereavement, that sickness—they were brought by the loving hand of God, who sought to help you through the discipline of life into a better and truer faith and spirit. Ah! if you would do it, and bear it cheerfully and believe in its beneficence to you, if God were so visibly revealed to you and spoke, why is it that you, knowing that your life will be one day made plain, take up the cross grudgingly, murmuringly, with discontent, with dissatisfaction and distress, and no not remember—for this is the very law by which we live—that only the after life and the after circumstances will reveal to you the full meaning of the discipline and sorrows of your life? "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." If such a spirit were ours, then, even when the loss and

the sorrow, the death and the privation came, we should say of them, "This also is the word of the Lord."

Lastly, I would ask you to see the light which that thought throws upon the suggestions of *duty*—duty, stern daughter of the voice of God.

If that has any meaning, it has a claim upon your life and mine. But what I ask you to observe is this. We never realise the splendour and the significance of the duties which are laid upon us, when measured by our own small life; they seem so trifling. Look for a moment at the prophet. That which he did might, from one standpoint, be said to be merely the desire of a man to possess some landed property, merely the wish of a man that he may be in the possession of his ancestral heritage; but when the opportunity came he said, "This suggestion is the word of the Lord." For his action was no longer a commercial action done between himself and his kinsman; it became then a great action, typical, representative, manifesting to Israel the real attitude of strength with which Israel should confront its dangers. That which was at first sight a mere action of trade and commerce, the buying of a bit of land, became a splendid action of noble patriotism, of great and majestic heroism. Remember, Jeremiah's action becomes of more significance, because he was regarded by the men of his day as a pessimist in public affairs. He said: "Your resistance of the enemy is absolutely hopeless; the Chaldeans will be here, the Babylonish armies will occupy this city, and your king shall be taken into captivity." He believed absolutely that the fate of Jerusalem was at hand. He had not the slightest doubt in his own mind that the sins of the people had so morally and so physically weakened them that their power of resistance had gone, and that it was only through the avenue of the bitter discipline of exile they could resume their power of national life; and so, as a pessimist—mark!—as one who believed that the fate of Jerusalem was sealed, and that the armies would soon be within the walls, and that captivity would inevitably follow—that is the man who says, "I am ready to lay down my money and purchase the field outside the gates of the city, because I have this pledge—I know that the enemy will come in, but I know also that there is an absolute security for this soil of Israel, the soil which the Lord God gave to Israel of old; though I see nothing before us but the dark avenue of captivity, though I see our path is beset with the hostility of the enemy and the overthrow of our city, still I know that path will emerge into an ultimate place of joy, when God shall spread the banquet once more for His people, and the land which has been captured shall be restored, and Israel's position shall be eternalised." In other words, he looks right forward and sees the splendour of his mission, which was to cry to the people: "Though I have said to you that the neglect of Jerusalem shall not be pardoned, and only wiped out by this bitter discipline, never, never despair of Israel." Like the old Roman, it was the purchase of the land while the enemy was in possession which gave dignity to his action. The Roman by his action said, "Though the enemy be at the gates, I do not despair of the welfare of the republic." Jeremiah's action said more: "I do not believe that one rood of the sacred soil shall ever permanently be in the possession of the enemies of God"; and it was the splendour therefore, the significance, of the action which was flashed upon him at the moment when the opportunity of the purchase came; and that which was once a dream is become a reality. And he could therefore prove to the people the reality of his faith in the hope and in the destiny of Israel. The meaning and the significance of that action none of his countrymen could gainsay, because he was ready to venture his money. That is the spirit of it.

Every duty costs something: it costs some trouble, some pains, some thought, some money. Duty, whatever is in your life, is not always an easy thing, unless your nature has been celestialised, and duty has become a delight. But that, after all, belongs rather to the higher levels of life than that commonly apportioned to humankind. Would duty be less noble if duty were easy? Is it not precisely because the steep up which you climb is rocky; because you must sometimes fall, and climb on hands and knees ere you can get to the height where the light of God is shining; because it means the expenditure of fame, money—whatever it is; because the duty is shirked—that therefore the duty is noble? It does cost something; and the man who talks glibly about duty, but is never ready to pay the price of his duty, to purchase his duty by the laying down of some present price, either of money or of time—that man, whatever else he may say, does not believe in the splendid imperative of duty, he does not believe in the voice of God behind it. Oh yes! if thoughts have crossed your mind, dimly perhaps, and then in some moments of generous dreaming, when you have imagined what your life might be, and you have seen yourself mounting higher and yet higher on the path of duty, and with bleeding hands clinging on to the duty which you know is yours; some great call in the people's welfare, where you must meet with some unpopularity; some duty in the home which means the sacrifice of yourself, perhaps the humiliation of your pride—because your are obliged to make little changes in the home, and you fear the half-suppressed smiles of the children or the servants—whatever be the aspect of it, remember this: when the opportunity comes, when it stands and confronts you, not in the glamoured light of your own dreams, but in the dry light of duty to be done, then, are you

ready to pay the price? If not you are the dreamer of duty and not the doer of it; and the hour may come when you will say, "That was my opportunity, but now it stands and looks upon me with that great reproach as a duty which once confronted me, but which I turned my back upon." Every duty done is like the thread which leads through the labyrinth of life, and explains for you at last the secret meaning of it within. Each day's duty, the suggestion, the commonplace thing which you thought hardly worth the doing, is like the silken thread which is linked to yet a coarser one, which links itself again to the stronger rope, and at last draws the great force of your life after it. So is every suggestion, and afterwards you perceive that that passing suggestion was indeed the word of the Lord.

Then what shall I say in conclusion? This much. If I want now to correct the dulness of my eyesight and be illumined by that light which will enable me to perceive that the Divine light is there, which will enable me to hear in every call the voice of the Lord, what shall be my best means of achieving this? Let the past illumine the present; go back on your life and observe it. You now can perceive exactly where it was you missed your way, because you now know that, if you had done this or omitted to do that, if you had not been the victim of that delusion, you would have been in a different position. You see now that that voice at your side was indeed the voice of the Lord. Let the past illumine the present. Do not treat duties as trivial and commonplace, because as your present life illuminates your past life and shows you how God's voice has been in it, so the future may illumine the duties which appeal to you to-day. We often say that the dead are canonised in our memory. When they pass away with their greatness, they seem to move from the crowd of men and march with stately steps, and take their place in the great banquet-halls of those whom memory holds illustrious and dear; and from out those banquet-halls they look down with eyes brimming with reproach, because we do not value them as we might. So our duties, canonised by the light which the present throws upon them, march stately before us; they take their place high above, and there are reproaches in their eyes; and the future will have reproaches like this, if we do not perceive the voice of the Lord at our side. The real thing which dims our eyes is the limited light we bring, measuring all the incidents of life by self. We take our little guttering farthing candle to our work-room, and we see everything with this. We cannot see the stitches, and we dread the shadows that move and flicker, the shadows which the gaunt light of the room casts in every direction. Bring in the larger light. Why, that old Roman brought in the larger light, when he saw in the purchase of the land not his own private gain, but the welfare of the republic. He saw his duty in the larger light of the well-being of the men and women about him. Let in the light of other men's interests, let in the light of the welfare of those about you, and then you cannot say that the duties are insignificant, then their voice will be to you the voice of humanity's need, and you will see a dignity in obeying it. Look upon every action of your life, not in relation to self or to the men and women about you, but in relation to God. Let in that larger light. Then every action of yours has its transcendent significance; then His Divine voice appeals to you; then you say, "Every habit I contract, every word I speak, every opportunity I miss, may be a Divine opportunity slighted, the Divine voice turned back upon."

TENDERNESS.

By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Durham

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey.

"Who can bear gently with the ignorant and erring, for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity."—Hebrews v. 2.

THESE words are, as you will remember, part of the description of the qualifications of a high priest—of one that is, who, by Divine appointment under the Jewish dispensation, represented man to God and God to man. Such a representative, as the Apostle shows, must not only share the nature of those for whom he acts, he must also know its innermost and saddest secrets. He must see with the eyes of a holy and compassionate soul the sources and the issues of sin in his fellow-men, not as if he were wholly beyond the reach of temptation, arrayed in impenetrable mail, but as being himself, in the expressive language of the original, "clad in meekness." He must be able to exercise a calm and gentle judgment, not as one insensible to pain and sorrow and indignation, but because he has been trained by resolute and patient self-questionings to bring truth to the ignorant and guidance to the erring, skilled by the experience of his own heart to show pity without weakness, and to lead to obedience through just and loving severity. The sense of our own infirmity is, indeed, a priceless power for the fulfilment of our human work. It teaches us the momentous issues of little things. It reveals to us the easy transition from thoughtless indolence to active evil-doing. It awakens our fears where the self-confident see no danger; and it sustains our hope as conscious of God's mercy to ourselves, when the self-righteous pass a fatal sentence of despair. The holiest men have always felt most keenly the terrible possibilities of their own nature, and trusted most boldly to God's help for the fallen. It is not the consciousness of guilt, but the

consciousness of infirmity, which is the surest spring of human sympathy. The truest compassion will belong to him who has borne all the assaults of evil without defeat, when he recalls how, at each moment, he was saved by strength not his won.

I do not, however, wish at present to pursue these far-reaching reflections on the beneficent lessons which come from the acknowledgment of our personal frailty. I wish only to touch upon the special relation which it has to our dealings with the things under us. We have seen already that the Christian will regard the things above him with reverence, and the things about him with sympathy. I hope that we shall see now that he will regard the things under him with tenderness. The subject has a direct and momentous interest to us all. Our relation to the things under us is the most certain touch-stone of our character. Here we display quite freely what we are. We embody, on a small scale, as it may be, the spirit of fathers or the spirit of despot. We employ our superiority of power, whatever it is, either to bring to a clearer light the signs of God's counsel in external nature which wait for our interpretation, or to assert ourselves in the impotence of caprice as able to preserve, or to deface, or to destroy that which is, indeed, God's work. We either use that which is at our disposal arbitrarily for our own pleasure, or we deal with it as representing some fragment of a complicated order of life. We depress our dependents and our subordinates, the weaker men who come within our influence, that we may be isolated in the splendour of a lonely tyranny, or we strive to lift them little by little towards our own level, that in the great day of revelation we may be seen standing by the throne in the midst of many brethren; for, when we speak of the things under us, we must give to the phrase a much larger meaning than we commonly attach to it. It reaches far beyond the men who are under us. The revelation which has been made to us of the Divine plan of creation shows that we are placed in a world over the whole of which we have to exercise dominion, charged, as the true ruler must be charged, with a responsibility towards every part of it. We have from the first a responsibility towards the material fabric of the world, no less than towards the hosts of sentient beings by which this material fabric is peopled. And then, as the ages go forward, our responsibility increases, as we were reminded this morning. The feebler races which fall behind in the development of life become subject to the stronger, and the feebler men to those who in any respect have been endowed with the prerogative of command. Thus the sphere of the responsibility of those to whom power is given becomes indefinitely varied, but in each case the position of authority brings with it the burden of noble cares. In each case, as things actually are, there is much to sadden and perplex the toiling soul which looks for some reflection of the image of God in all His works, and finds everywhere pain, conflict, and sin. In each case the spirit of tenderness learns the deep lesson of considerate wisdom which is the law of kingship, and teaches man to exercise his delegated sovereignty over the earth and its fulness with calm faith as the minister of one who is at once the creator and heir of all things; for, saddened and perplexed though we may be, by the difficulties which beset the use of our power, we cannot abdicate it. We all must and do exercise dominion for good or for evil, and we all need the spirit of tenderness that our dominion may be a blessing. Tenderness is for dominion what sympathy is for fellowship. Tenderness pierces through the surface to the heart of things. It is true of tenderness, in every application of the pregnant figure, that it "will not break the bruised reed or quench the smoking flax." It discerns the element of strength in that which is most frail, and the element of life in that which is darkest. It sees in forms transitory and common divine gifts to be handled reverently. It sees in simple and subject types of life memories, as it were, and promises of a great plan slowly fulfilled from stage to stage. It sees in the rudest human mind a mirror for reflecting, however imperfectly, the image of a Father in heaven; and, as we trust the varied vision, new thoughts pass into our own souls, and we become conscious of hidden forces about us which are able to still the sorrowful impatience of our eager desires. Tenderness in each direction quickens our spiritual sensibility, and under inspired teaching, nature and creaturely life and even man's failures disclose mysteries of hope. It springs out of our Christian faith. It is the obvious expression of our Christian faith in regard to the things under us.

There is, I say, a tenderness towards material things which belongs to the Christian character. The thought may seem to be strange, but it is both true and important. And in saying this I do not press that "pathetic fallacy," as it has been called which leads us to transfer our own emotions to natural objects, as if they rejoiced and mourned with us. I should not, indeed, admit that the feeling is a fallacy. It seems to me to be, more truly, a prophecy which is hastening to fulfilment. But now I speak only of what is absolutely unquestionable — of that watchful, reverent regard that every one who believes in the Incarnation must turn to the least work which he finally refers to the love of God,—of that patient care with which He will wait for influences corresponding to their nature flowing from all things in which he recognises a Divine Presence. And this tenderness, born from the recognition of God in His creatures, shows itself both in use and in contemplation. There is something of touching solemnity in the form of the Jewish thanksgiving over bread and wine, which may go back even to

the apostolic age, "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe." The words remind us that the least and commonest comes from Him who sways the whole. He Himself is seen in His gifts, and in that presence there can be no wastefulness, no carelessness, no ungrateful discontent. In proportion as we realise what it is which is given for our use, we shall feel the wide application of the Lord's command: "Gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost." Even light and food may be dishonoured by reckless indifference; and we may miss, by blind prodigality, the teachings which come through trivial acts to tender souls.

It is, perhaps, yet more obvious how tenderness finds a place in the contemplation of material things. To the hard and the impatient there is no sanctity in the purple mountain-side, no beauty born of murmuring sounds, no majesty in the light of setting suns. The silence that is in the starry sky, the sleep that is among the lonely hills, have for them no articulate message; but, none the less, the sanctity, beauty, majesty, tidings of great truths are there, and the quiet eye can gather the spiritual harvest. He who has lovingly watched the star-shaped shadow of the flower upon the stone will soon learn the mysteries which only await an interpreter in the daisy and the primrose or the rainbow and the storm—will soon learn what wealth of joy is ready for us in the universal environment of life, will soon learn that the floating clouds and the flowing river, the sunshine and the shadow, the commonest sights and sounds, can bring pleasure to the tender-hearted, purer and more restful than the costliest of artificial excitements.

Thus we can see how tenderness has its scope and blessing in mute, insensate things; but perhaps it is most called for in our dealings with animals. These lie in our power in a peculiar sense, and we need to school ourselves that we may fulfil our duty towards them, for we have a duty towards them. They are not only for our service or for our amusement, they are committed by God to our sovereignty, and we owe to them a considerate regard for their rights. The truth is affirmed in the Bible with impressive distinctness. The Mosaic law lays down the essential principles of our obligation to the animals which are most closely associated with us. It enjoins positive kindness; it forbids that which would injure our own sense of the respect due to their natures. The familiar words of the book of Proverbs: "The righteous man regardeth the life of his beast," have in the original a far deeper truth: "He knoweth the soul of his beast." He takes account of its powers, its capacities, its feelings, with a sympathetic intelligence. The phrase can mean no less, and his deeds embody his knowledge. No animal, wild or domestic, can be treated as a thing. Wilful disregard of the sanctities of physical life in one sphere bears its fruit in other and higher spheres. The thrice-repeated command of the Pentateuch, "Thou shalt not seethe the kid in its mother's milk," is a parable which our great novelist, as we all remember, has truly applied. "The student of life knows that there is a tenderness of sentiment in regard to lower creatures, beyond all direct action, which cannot be violated with impunity." Our responsibility in this respect is easily forgotten. We have all felt, I fancy, something of that irrational pleasure in the capricious use of power which Browning has analysed in his portraiture of Caliban. The boy strikes down the butterfly, the man shoots the swallow on the wing, simply because he can and because he chooses. But these wanton acts are not indifferent. They tend to reveal and to mould character. They break the righteous conditions of our sovereignty. The thought has a wide and a pleasant application, for, looking at the question from this light, I do not see how the pursuit of amusement can justify the slaughter of animals, or how the pursuit of knowledge can justify their torture. Neither amusement nor knowledge is an end for man. Both must be followed in full view of the supreme aim of life, and in remembrance of the abiding character on which each action leaves its mark. We have surely forgotten the first cause of human pleasure if the number of victims provided for our aim whom we can kill is the measure of our satisfaction; and I must hold that the knowledge of the amount of pain which the faithful hound will suffer before he loses his love for the master who torments him is knowledge fit only for a demon.

But it may be said we shall gain an insight into the hidden causes of disease, and a mastery over them, through the sufferings which we deliberately inflict on the creatures which are within our control. So far as I can ascertain, the expectation has not been justified by facts, nor can I discover the least reasonable ground for supposing that we shall learn any secrets of life which it is good for us to know by the way of calculated cruelty. If the world were the work of an evil power, or if it were the result of a chance interaction of force and matter, it would be at least possible that we might have gained results physically beneficial to ourselves by the unsparing sacrifice of lower lives. But if He who made us made all other creatures also—if they find a place in His providential plan—if His tender mercies reach to them—and this we Christians most certainly believe—then I find it absolutely inconceivable that He should have so arranged the avenues of knowledge that we can attain to truths which it is His will that we should master only through the unutterable agonies of beings which trust in us. Life is more than a bundle of physical facts. Life in its distinct form is a sacred gift to be dealt with reverently. Life for the Christian is an energy not

apart from Christ. Better, then, than any precarious increase of our acquaintance with phenomena—better than any fresh supply of vital force drawn for man from the mutilated beast—better than a brief span possibly added to our earthly sojourn, is the pure consciousness that we have not broken down the barriers of a holy reverence, or sought relief for our own pain by inflicting it on some weaker being.

If we have guarded the spirit of tenderness in our bearing towards the material world and the animal world, we shall be prepared to apply it also towards weaker races and weaker men who are in greater or less degree brought within our influence. I speak only of our relations to individual men; and here a boundless field is opened to all of us for the exercise of sympathetic tenderness. Every one holds a position of superiority as parent or employer, as richer than others in experience or knowledge, as endowed with authority by years or position; and every one knows the daily vexations which come through the thoughtlessness, or ignorance, or indifference, as it seems to us, of those whom we wish to help in the fulfilment of their duty. Everyone, again, has suffered from the temptation which bids the stronger assert his will by his strength, and overbear what he thinks to be an unintelligent opposition, and claim deference as an unquestionable right. At such times we are on our trial, and sympathetic tenderness alone will save us from falling; for tenderness will trace back the wayward act to some trait of natural character which gentle discipline can mould to good. It will discern that involuntary ignorance is to be dealt with as a form of intellectual distress. It will win respect before it claims deference for the authority with which it is entrusted. It will, in a word, turn stumbling-blocks into stepping-stones, and find by them the way into many hearts.

But it is in dealing with the poorest that tenderness will help us most; and when I speak of the poorest, I mean those who are poorest in thought, in feeling, in aspiration more than those who are poorest in earthly things. Spiritual poverty is more sad and more repellant than material poverty, and it is perfectly compatible with great possessions. The chilling penury of moral indigence, blank insensibility to the ideal of life, are not confined to any class, and they are most disastrous and most inexcusable in the highest. But while it is easy to caricature the grossness of self-indulgence and self-seeking, to hold it up to scorn, to denounce it, the evil will not be overcome by satire or by ridicule. The poor man needs relief —the poor in virtue no less than the poor in money. The bankrupt in noble thoughts is set up again only when he sees the good for which he was made, and sees that it is still within his reach. This prospect tenderness can disclose to him—a tenderness which in view of the saddest spectacles of human failure, kindles in the believer a fire of piety, a light of natural affection, and reveals in the brother for whom Christ died the possibility and the hope of service; for tenderness, no less than reverence and sympathy, flows from Christ only as an inexhaustible source. The world cannot support it. There is, as long as we keep within the range of phenomena, a terrible disharmony between the thought of God and the actual aspect of things. We look out on Nature, and the first view overwhelms us by its magnificence. We look again, and we discover everywhere signs of decay and ruin, of conflict and waste, of change and transitoriness. If the glory of God is written in the firmament, the triumph of His enemy is visible on the earth. Bewildered and cast down, we look once more, and there rises over all the Cross of Christ the eternal symbol of the efficacy of sacrifice, the pledge of love victorious over death. Forthwith the disharmony is resolved; the terms of the contrast are reconciled. The immensity of the universe is reconciled with the dignity of man; the sufferings of life are reconciled with the most splendid hope. We hear the voice which tells us that "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now," and through that assurance, however little we may be able to interpret in detail what we see, every sorrow is known to be a birth-pang of a new order, and every sigh becomes a witness to the inheritance which God has prepared for us. From the knowledge of ourselves and of what God has done for us, we can thankfully recognise even the feeblest beginnings of a Divine life and the faintest trace of a Divine kinsmanship among those in whom we are set to work, and tenderly cherish and deepen them. And as we do so, the tenderness which we use will bring back to us the quiet confidence which is the stay of cheerful and substantial labour. Undisturbed by problems which still wait for a solution, undismayed by failures through which we have been led to surer wisdom, we shall learn to carry our cross—the heavy burdens, that is, which come through human wilfulness and human unbelief—and bear gently with the ignorant, for that we ourselves also are compassed with infirmity, and yet more than conquerors in Christ.

THE Rev. W. A. Bartlett, vicar of Wisborough, was unanimously elected on Thursday, the 31st ult., for the third time, as Commissioner for the archdeaconry of Chichester, under the Pluralities Act, for the ensuing three years.

THE Rev. C. Mansfield Owen, vicar of St. George's, Edgbaston, has been appointed honorary Canon of Worcester, in succession to the late Canon Purton. Mr. Owen, says the *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, was appointed clerical honorary secretary to the Church Extension Society, in succession to the Bishop of Coventry, and has taken an active interest in the work of the society. "During his ministry the work done in the parish of St. George's has been greatly developed."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 9, 1892.

THE SHAH'S TYRANNY.

IT seems that the Shah of Persia's visit to Europe instead of leading to any beneficial change in his policy merely confirmed him in his cruel and despotic rule. The sale of the tobacco monopoly to English speculators was in fact a most abominable interference with the trade rights and privileges of Persians. It was keenly resented, and the consequent tumults which arose in all parts of Persia were for months barbarously met, as usual, with imprisonment and torture. But new influences were at work which neither the Shah nor his venal ministers had reckoned with. A masterly organisation, directed by certain Persian magnates in Europe, massed the people together in serried ranks under their Moolahs, or priests. Suddenly the Shah found himself confronted with an indignant conspiracy of protest, so wide spread and so well organised, that he was convinced further resistance was impossible. He accordingly revoked the most offensive half of the detested Tobacco Regie, referring to the native trade (internal), retaining only the comparatively harmless clauses dealing with the export trade. It is a great liberal victory, the first time in modern history, that a Shah has ever been systematically coerced by his own people without a bloody revolution. We understand that the Moolahs intend to push the policy vigorously in the direction of further reform.

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have assigned a new ecclesiastical district or consolidated chapelry, carved out of the parishes of Pemberton, St. Andrew's, All Saints', St. Thomas's, and St. James's, Wigan, to the new church of St. Mark's, Newtown, Pemberton.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." December, 1891—January, 1892. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THERE is a paper in the December number on the Aramaic Gospel, by Professor Marshall, in which he continues his examination of Duplicate Translations in the Gospel of St. Mark, but the January number contains no paper on the subject. We most sincerely hope this does not mean that the series has come to an end: it certainly has not finished. When the series is finished, the Professor ought to sum up the argument of his very able and most interesting papers; and after that we hope some competent scholar, who does not agree, will write an answer.

We have not read Dr. Dale's "Fellowship with Christ"—not owing to indifference, but owing to illness—so we decline to discuss Dr. Candlish's review or rather reply. The charge is of holding something very like the heresy (if it is a heresy) of Universalism; we should not have suspected Dr. Dale; but we will not criticise the article.

Dr. J. A. Beet begins a series of papers on the "Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament." His purpose, he says, is "to reproduce from the documents preserved for us in the New Testament the conception, or conceptions, of their various writers about the death of Christ, and its relation to His work and to the kingdom of God, in order thus to determine as accurately and fully as possible the position of the death of Christ in God's eternal purpose of salvation." To carry out this purpose he proposes to examine Christ's own words as recorded by the Synoptists; in St. John's Gospel; the teaching of the Galilean Apostles as preserved in the Acts; of St. Paul; and of the Epistles to the Hebrews. We should like to quote what Dr. Beet says of the evidence of the Eucharist to the Atonement: "Moreover while living and well, Christ institutes a ceremony to commemorate His approaching death. Such an institution, ordained under such circumstances, is unique in the history of the world. Commemorations of the death of a martyr or a hero are not unfrequent. But we never heard of one enjoined by the martyr himself, and especially while in liberty and health. Moreover, generally, or always, commemorations of a violent death have been incitements to vengeance. But of vengeance we have no trace here. And the name *Eucharist*, given to the rite from very early days, suggests only gratitude to God."

You cannot tear away the miraculous from the picture of Jesus and yet retain the teaching; that, we think, is the gist of the first of Dean Chadwick's series on the miracles of Christ. It is true; but does it not tell more against the Unitarian than against the so-called scientist?

Dr. Stalker writes a very interesting and thoughtful article on the "Book of Lamentations;" Dr. Sanday continues his series on "The Present Position of the Johanean Question;" and Dr. Cox, who is always interesting, writes on the "Divine Looking-Glass."

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." December, 1891—January, 1892. Edinburgh: T. and J. Clark.

OUT of a number of excellent and interesting articles, we select the following suggestion relative to the R.V.:—"What I think is wanted practically is that

the R.V. should be prescribed as a text-book by examiners of schools. The Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate examines 10,000 boys and girls annually,—how much they might do for the more accurate knowledge of the Bible by merely announcing that they will examine in the Revised Version only. I do not think many people whose opinion is of value will question that (whatever the suitability of the R.V. for other purposes) it is much superior to the A.V. as a text-book in Scripture History. It saves a vast deal of annotation which occupies the time of a class, and taxes the memory of pupils. No one, in teaching young boys Greek, would supply them with a reprint of the *editio princeps* of the author, and then spend their time in class in correcting the text; but such a method would involve less unnecessary expenditure of the time and attention that a conscientious teacher must give to corrections of the A.V., if it is in his pupils' hands."

We think that unless this or some similar suggestion is acted on, the R.V. is in danger of becoming a literary event in the nineteenth century. In the country, so far as we can tell, booksellers admit *some* sale, but are not enthusiastic. Will the splendid new edition on Indian paper sell?

Both numbers are full of valuable, but too short, papers; we should say the *Expository Times* is gaining, and deserves to gain a good reputation amongst Biblical scholars, especially amongst the younger men.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"IS THERE A PURGATORY?"

SIR,—Will Mr. Donaldson consider St. Paul says there are three heavens. So there may be a place of safety for all, as we have in the church, fabric, chancel, nave, and porch—a place for saints, people, and outsiders; or for—(1) Christians; (2) Mahommedans and Buddhists; and (3) heathen.

God is the Potter; it is not for Clay (man), to quarrel with the use made of him.

But God is Love.

All sin must be punished; the term of punishment is with God, and when the term is accomplished then He accepts the mediation of His Son, and He can place man in 1, 2, or 3 as He sees fit.

How fearful to think even of a measure of punishment—say one hundred years in hell—*conscious* of time, no night.

God is Love.

I am thankful to think it.

VICAR.

SIR,—In reply to the inquiry made by the gentleman, who is generally rude to those who differ from him, I will quote some of his expressions. In his letter of Dec. 4th, he says: "It very clearly appears that 'J. B.' does not understand the authors whom he quotes"; also, "his notion of universal restoration has its origin in his own intellectual confusion." In the PULPIT of Saturday he very nearly calls his brother a fool. The phrase is, "in his last letter of 19th inst., he commits the same piece of folly."

Such expressions I consider to be an offence against the rules of courtesy; and they cannot possibly be attended with any benefit to the cause of truth. The scriptural rule for Christian discussion is, "Speaking the truth in love." I might also refer to the precept of the Saviour, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

It seems almost incredible that any one who speaks in such a confident and arrogant way should not take the trouble of introducing accuracy into his quotations. Let him look again at my letter in the PULPIT of 19th ult., and he will see that the Bishop of Manchester states distinctly, "Unto the æons means only a period indefinitely long."

It seems clear to me that the English words "eternal" and "everlasting" have been and still are generally understood by Englishmen to mean "endless." But the original words which are rendered "eternal" and "everlasting" in our Authorised and Revised Version of the Bible do not mean "endless."

I have given various quotations from Jerome, and I think they may be understood without much difficulty.

Canonbury, January 4th, 1892. J. B.

SIR,—I pointed out in the PULPIT of the 19th ult. that St. Paul, in Romans xvi. 25, applies the word eternal to time which is past already. Dr. Donaldson, in that of the 2nd inst, says that my interpretation is impossible, because in the next verse the word eternal is applied to God, and His existence can never be past.

A mere *reductio ad absurdum* like this is worth but little in determining the meaning of a word, and I do not think any scholar would attach importance to it. Dr. Donaldson's argument does not touch the question of what St. Paul actually meant to say, but only of what Dr. Donaldson thinks it likely that he meant. For such a reason to be conclusive we should be certain that words are used with a perfectly uniform meaning; and we cannot always be certain of this. It is really a question of fact, not of antecedent probability.

I quote the following from Romans xvi. 25, 26:—"The revelation of the mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known unto all the nations." Compare with this 2nd Timothy, 1, 9, 10:—"His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before times eternal, but hath now been manifested by the appearing of our Saviour Christ Jesus, who abolished death."

In the old version, "through times eternal" was translated, "since the world began," and "before times eternal" was translated, "before the world began." But with the Greek before us, or the true translation in the Revised Version, it admits of no doubt whatever that the "times eternal" in the former of these two passages are the times which ended with the coming of Christ; and in the latter passage they are either the times which began with the coming of Christ or, more probably, with the creation of the world.

Dr. Donaldson refers to the account of the judgment in Matthew xxv., and asks if the word eternal has not the same meaning when applied to punishment or chastisement as when applied to life. I do not question this—it means age-long in both places; but it may be reasonably contended that both punishment and life will last each its own age, but the

age of punishment is temporary, and that of life is strictly everlasting.

"His anger is but for a moment :
His favour is for a lifetime : (marginal reading)
Weeping may tarry for the night,
But joy cometh in the morning."
Psalm xxx. 5, Revised Version.

I have to remark, in conclusion, that Dr. Donaldson had better read the Bishop of Manchester's book before he corrects a quotation from it. I have carefully read it, and it nowhere asserts the hopelessness of the future state.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, December 3rd, 1892.

MR. CAROLIN'S QUOTATION.

SIR,—In Mr. Carolin's sermon, published in the PULPIT of the 2nd inst., Shakespeare is quoted as follows :—

"To thine own self be true ;
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

Now, these are not Shakespeare's words; they are spoken by Polonius, who throughout the play of "Hamlet" is represented as a fool, deviating into wisdom only when he quotes proverbial expressions. He had heard or read the saying :—

"To thine own self be true ;
Thou canst not then be false to any man ;"

and when repeating it he inserted, out of his own silly head, the exquisitely absurd comparison of this sequence to that of day and night.

This view of the passage is supported by another saying of his, in which he has improved a proverbial saying with still more conspicuous absurdity. He quotes a saying that he had heard :

"Brevity is the soul of wit."

This is a good proverbial saying ; but he thus improves it :—

"Brevity is the soul of wit,
And tediousness the limbs and outward flourishes."

"Tediousness the limbs of wit!" Yet this utter absurdity might be quoted as from Shakespeare without verbal falsehood.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, January 3rd, 1892.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baldwin, Rev. Canon Charles, Vicar of Berwick-upon-Tweed ; Rural Dean of Norham, Northumberland.
Bassett, Rev. Stewart Tilney, M.A., Curate of Dulverton ; Vicar of Gooderstone, Norfolk.
Bather, Rev. Henry S., M.A., Vicar of Meole Brace, Salop ; Archdeacon of Ludlow, and Canon Residentiary of Hereford Cathedral.
Bosanquet, Rev. C. C. C., M.A. ; Vicar of Lowdham, Notts.
Bramley, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Uffculme, Devon, Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral.
Brooke, Rev. William, M.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Archdeanery of Derby ; Rector of Frenchay, near Bristol.
Brown, Rev. Christopher Musgrave, M.A.; Vicar of St. Alban's, Bevington, Liverpool.
Cleminson, Rev. Alfred George; Rector of Akeley, Bucks.
Coombs, Rev. H. L. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Ford, near Devonport; Vicar of Thornes, Wakefield.
Crawley-Boevey, Rev. Richard Lloyd, M.A.; Rector of Doynton, near Bath.
Cronshey, Rev. Frederick J., M.A., Curate of Battle, Sussex ; Rector of St. Mary's, Thetford, Norfolk.
Dawson, Rev. Alexander, Curate of St. Stephen's, Newcastle-on-Tyne ; Vicar of St. John's, Barnsley.
De Chair, Rev. F. B., M.A., Rector of Morleys St. Botolph's-with-St. Peter's, Norfolk ; Rural Dean of Hingham (Forehoe Division).
Ellis, Rev. Roberts ; Honorary Canon of St. Asaph Cathedral.
Evans, Rev. L. H., M.A., Vicar of Hope, near Leominster ; Vicar of St. John's and St. Mary's, Brecon.
Gell, Rev. Francis, M.A., Rector of Alvechurch and Chaplain to the Bishop of Worcester ; Rural Dean of Northfield.
Hall, Rev. F. D., M.A. ; Rural Dean of Louthesk and Ludburgh No. 2.
Jackson, Rev. George W., M.A., late Curate of the Church of the Holy Saviour, Tynemouth ; Vicar of the New Church at Delaval, near Seghill, Northumberland.
Jones, Rev. William Marlow O'Brady ; Vicar of St. Luke's, Wallsend.
King, Rev. A. G., A.K.C., Curate of St. Saviour's-with-St. James's, Walthamstow, Essex ; Incumbent of Burra-Burra, South Australia.
Lewis, Rev. W. A., M.A., Vicar of Thornes, near Wakefield ; Vicar of St. Mark's, Ford, Devonport.
Madge, Rev. Arthur Giles, M.A., Second Master of Walford Endowed School ; Head-master of Horncastle Grammar-school.
Oliver, Rev. Arthur West, M.A. ; Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Bootle.
Owen, Rev. C. Mansfield, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Edgbaston ; Honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral.
Pearce, Rev. Duncan, M.A. ; Vicar of St. Saviour's, Colgate, Sussex.
Richards, Rev. W. L., M.A., Curate of Llandudno ; Vicar of Resolven, Vale of Neath.
Smailes, Rev. Frederick William, M.A. ; Rector of St. Michael's, Lewes, Sussex.
Standage, Rev. Samuel Ray ; Vicar of Claydon, Oxon.
Sweet-Escott, Rev. John Howard, M.A.; Rector of Kingston Pagpuze, Berks.
Vale, Rev. H. H., sometime Curate of All Saints', Smallheath, Birmingham ; Incumbent of Waratah, Diocese of Tasmania.
Williams, Rev. Prebendary Herbert, M.A.; Rector of Rhayader.
Wrenford, Rev. William Stinson, Vicar of St. Luke's, Wallsend ; Vicar of Matfen, Northumberland.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bagot, Rev. Frederick, D.C.L., thirty-two years Rector of Harpsden, at Harpsden Rectory, Henley-on-Thames, on the 1st inst., aged 69.
Casher, Rev. C. E., Chaplain to the Middlesex County Asylum, Tooting, on the 30th ult.
Cohen, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Heston, and formerly Rector of Whitechapel, on the 31st ult., aged 75.
Ely, Rev. Edwyn Anthony, J.P. for Monmouthshire, formerly Rector of Lassington, at Bwlch Trewyn, Abergavenny, on the 27th ult., aged 53.
Gilson, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Vicar of Hixon, formerly Archdeacon of Montreal, at Leamington, on the 2nd inst.
Glen, Rev. William, for twenty-two years Curate of Mortlake, at Mortlake, on the 27th ult., aged 57.
Hutchinson, Rev. John Rogers, M.A., Parish Priest, at Normacot Vicarage, on the 2nd inst., aged 43.
Jones, Rev. Thomas, for many years Curate of the Parish, at Llansantffraid-yn-Mechain, on the 24th ult., aged 49.
Kekewich, Rev. Arthur Langston, at Dover, on the 31st ult., aged 29.
Norris, Ven. John Pilkington, D.D., Archdeacon of Bristol, at Bristol, on the 29th ult., aged 68.
Oldham, Rev. James, sometime Rector of Overdale, at Great Malvern, Worcestershire, on the 24th ult., aged 61.
Partridge, Rev. Walter John, forty-seven years Curate and Rector of Caston, at Bath, on the 27th ult., aged 78.
Purton, Rev. John Smith, Rector of Chetton and Honorary Canon of Worcester, at Chetton Rectory, Bridgnorth, on the 29th ult., aged 67.
Soames, Rev. Douglas, Chaplain in H.M. Forces, at Daventry, on the 29th ult., aged 46.
Van Linge, Rev. John, D.D., at Exeter, on the 22nd ult., aged 79.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE VALUE OF THE MIRACULOUS.

By the Rev. J. LIGHTFOOT, D.Sc., M.A., Vicar of Cross Stone, Todmorden, Yorkshire.

Sermon Preached in the Foundling Chapel, at the Sunday Morning Service.

"If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."—Luke xvi. 31.

THERE are several deeply important questions connected with the parable of the "Rich man and Lazarus," a fragment of which I have taken as my text to-day. The parable is generally quoted for the light which it throws upon the condition of the dead. The repose in Abraham's bosom, the torments of the rich man, the impassable gulf—these are the oft-quoted statements upon which a large proportion of so-called Christian eschatology has been founded. I do not, however, propose to discuss any of these questions. Sermons and books upon these subjects are common enough, but of doubtful wisdom. The thoughtful reader of the Bible will infer from its significant silence on man's condition after this life that the subject is one utterly unsuitable for theorising. This life is our practical and momentous concern. Now is the accepted time. Now are we the sons of God, it doth not yet appear what we shall be. Whatever God may have in store hereafter for man, it is the sanctification of His temper now; it is that man's present life may be blessed; this is the object towards which all religious effort rightly tends. The student of the Old Testament will without difficulty conclude, that although in a few chosen souls the thought of hereafter became a powerful motive, yet that worldly prosperity in the best sense was that which was held out to the ancient Jew as the reward of holiness of life.

In the New Testament we have the clearest assertions of man's immortality; but there is not associated therewith any of that specific teaching of the conditions of existence there in which popular theology has abounded. When we remember that the Jewish thought of our Lord's time had borrowed its details respecting the next world very largely from Apocryphal writings, and that those books of the New Testament in which these subjects are mostly discussed are the books about whose value the largest amount of difficulty has been felt in the Christian Church, and once more that the solitary clause in the Apostle's Creed: "He descended into hell" (a clause not contained in the Nicene Creed)—that this clause was only added by some unknown hand in the fifth or sixth century—remembering all this, the devout Christian will attach a certain impropriety to such discussions altogether.

I venture to think that the parable from which my text is taken has its chief points of interest in the two recorded conversations between Abraham and the rich man. The first of these is especially significant, as teaching that many of the inequalities and perplexities of this life, which find no solution or redress here, will obtain a solution, and be atoned for there. The point lies in the words, "Son, remember that thou in thy life time hadst thy good things, and Lazarus his evil things." Now, however, the conditions are entirely reversed. The old-world perplexity of the triumph of wrongfulness, "I do see the ungodly in such prosperity," receives, to a large extent, an answer here.

The second conversation is also deeply instructive. The rich man in his life time was the type of a selfish man. Even in hades his first thought had been for himself. He asks for "water" to cool his tongue. The second request, however, shows that his altered circumstances have not been without a salutary effect upon him. God's judgments are ever intended to act thus. He punishes but to save; His woes are blessings in disguise. And so the rich man has room now for others in his thoughts. His five brethren, living on earth as indifferent to the great eternals as he had been, could not these be warned that they come not to the same condition that he was in? Dives felt, what many superficial men have likewise felt, that the conditions of man's probation are rather hard on man. Man has not warning sufficient, or evidence sufficiently overwhelming to compel assent. The small element of uncertainty is pleaded as a justification for indifference. But if these five brethren could only be more clearly assured all would be well. The man remembers that *he* had Moses and the prophets, but could his brethren not have something more than this. For example, a miracle—*that* would settle the question. If they might hear one speak who had been dead, then they could not help but have that supreme conviction of the unseen world that would reform their lives and save their souls. But the reply is "If a man will not hear Moses and the prophets, neither would he believe though the grave opened at his very feet and a dead man came out of his coffin to testify to him of these things."

And that answer we shall say at once is not only strange, but it has a very modern sound about it. There is a natural supposition in men's minds that faith and holiness would have been easier if they had lived in the times of our Lord, and if they could have seen one of His miracles wrought. In

short, the conception that men have is somewhat this—they have been taught to look upon the miracles of Christ as the necessary credentials of the truth which He proclaimed. Finding from the very nature of the case, and after so long a lapse of time, what they judge to be an insufficiency of evidence of this and that, or some difficulty in reconciling many details in the various histories of the miraculous events, they straightway reject all the miracles, and with them, of necessity, that unique worth which the Christian Church ascribes to the words and deeds of our Lord. The modern absolute trust in scientific methods largely assists this conclusion. The weight of all experience is so immeasurably preponderant in favour of a steady development of all natural occurrences, each step preparing the way for that which succeeds it, that though absolute proof is not hereby attained, yet the mind is hereby prepared to believe in only those noiseless, ceaseless works of God in Nature, not in sudden interruptions of an established order by occasional interference of Divine power.

The tendency of modern educated thought is running strongly in opposition to belief in miracles. If one really could happen *now*, and under such circumstances that men could really test it, then it is assumed that faith would become an easy exercise. Men could not help but believe. It is in view of this conviction that the judgment of the parable seems so significant. For the words translated into modern expressions really mean, that if a man will not believe the testimony of the witnesses for God in every generation, witnesses who have spoken for truth and righteousness—if these are insufficient in any given case, then there is no reason for supposing that such a person would be converted to holiness, even if he should witness an abrogation of one of the most general laws of nature.

This is what the statement means to us, but it did not of necessity mean so much to the people to whom our Lord addressed the words. Indeed, it is of larger importance to remember that a miracle is only really miraculous to us—that is to say, to men to whom the conception of Nature and the natural admits of no impulse of which the result does not follow necessarily and according to general laws from pre-existing conditions. It is this modern scientific notion of Nature that seems to admit of no possibility of the miraculous. But this was not the case with the Jew. The men of ancient days regarded every force that works in Nature as being directly guided by the end at which it aims. A miracle was not a contradiction outside the order of Nature, but was the occasional exercise of a superior power within the sphere where lesser powers were accustomed to work. The educated heathen no less than the Jew failed to see in Nature an established order. Such order as there could be violated by every petty heathen deity, and even men had at their command enchantments by which they could alter its course. This belief of the Jew and Greek of our Lord's day explains what to us seems unexplainable—viz, that the miracles of Christ during His lifetime, and the unique fact of His resurrection, produced so little result. With reference to the miracles in the Bible, it is quite noticeable that the narrators tell quite naturally how the "signs and wonders" produced only a very small amount of conviction in the minds of those who witnessed them, either of the authority or truth of the Saviour's mission. With these reflections in view, it is easy to see that with reference to the Jews of our Lord's time, who would not hear Moses and the prophets, that they would not either have been convinced if one had risen from the dead.

But this would only make the application of the text to us the more difficult. We have a conception of Nature, and God's relation therewith which forbids the easy-going explanation of the men of ancient days. Just as we have ceased to believe that witches and charms can violate an established order, so we have difficulty in finding room for even Divine interference. Hence it is natural to suppose that any strange, unusual event, such as a dead man coming to life, would have a supreme effect upon us. But a little reflection would show that this would not of necessity be so. Before experience of anything new, any result might seem equally strange and miraculous. After the result curiosity and the spirit of investigation is largely awakened, but this is a very different result to that personal subjection of my individual will and life to that of God, which we somewhat inappropriately call "faith."

The truly scientific conception of the universe is always quite other than a dreary atheism. Nature is only intelligible on the supposition that it is the transparent robe which clothes the Divine. We can no more conceive a universe without God than we can conceive a concave without a convex. The two are inseparable in any single thought. Science is only possible upon the supposition of the continual concourse of God with nature, mediating the action and reaction going on continuously between different parts of the world. We do not consider either the Divine life, or the Cosmic order, revealed in Nature, to be a fixed rigid immutability in which there would be nothing but a constantly-repeating cycle of phenomena. We can thus understand that the Divine relation to the world may be a variable quantity—the influence excited may be more prominent at special times. Science may not be brought to a recognition of the reality of miracles in the form in which popular theology generally demands it. But science will not offer, I believe, any serious opposition to the thought that the relation of God to the world is one which changes in the course of history, or to the belief that He was nearer to the world at some periods of the world than at others, and that His

influence has been imparted in a manner wholly unique at certain given crises of history.

This admission has not been considered sufficient by the Church, and orthodoxy has required the acceptance of the whole content of the Biblical history, and the recognition of those doctrines which the dogmatic theology of the Church has connected with them. Hence an amount of hostility to the Church has arisen in the minds of men of scientific acquirement. And, indeed, you have only to read some of the latest productions of fiction, or the more sober and accurate statements of Mr. Huxley and the Christian Apologists in the late and current numbers of the *Nineteenth Century*, to see that the difference is so great as to seem impossible of adjustment.

I believe I shall have the sympathy of you to whom I speak when I say that the work of a Christian clergyman should ever be constructive. There is plenty in Nature, in magazines, and the like, as well as in every-day life, to try very seriously our faith. We want thoughts that will help; we want a foundation upon which we may rest secure.

And if this be what you seriously desire, then be sure that true satisfaction is never hard to find. If so be you could see "signs and wonders," these would not convey to your spirit that which you seek. Think what true religion, true Christian religion, really is. Strip it of all the thousand controversies with which men have overlaid the fine gold. Go to the Jesuit priest, or to the Dissenting enthusiast, and learn from them what the religious life really is. They will all tell you, in the words of Cotze, that it is "the subjection in lowly humility of all one's own strength to the grace of God, the consciousness not only of that imperfection which has a meaning in the Cosmic order, but also of that sinfulness which is, but never ought to be, the confession of the inadequacy of all one's own deserts, and the hope of redemption from all evil through the love of God, which no one can deserve, but which every one can win." That is the religious creed reduced to its barest contents. This is practical Christianity stripped of the language in which the judgments of men for eighteen hundred years have embodied it.

And this I would impress upon you to whom I speak, that you never confuse the essentials of Christianity with this or that, which Christians may believe or teach. There is, no doubt, a deep necessity which has led to the drawing up of the various creeds and dogmatic statements of the churches. But these are to true religion only as the shadow is to the substance. It may be that in this sitting age—an age so restless in all its procedure, so feverish in the desire for something new—it may be that you will find yourself assailed by doubt concerning old cherished beliefs and truths which once you thought as unassailable as the everlasting hills. If so be that becomes a special trial to any of you, you will find it an agonising ordeal. I do not refer to the cheap and easy scepticism of shallow minds, which thinks it can shake the faith of ages with a sneer, and shatter the whole structure of God's Church with a jest. I mean doubt which is severe and agonising. If such be your trial, then may God give you grace to be faithful. At such a time you may be very largely helped by remembering two things.

First, that what is required in the way of intellectual assent, is something very different to what we preachers unconsciously have led men to suppose. Take our own Church for example. How wide are her limits in this respect, how grand is the liberty wherewith her children are made free. Churchmen fight upon little points of ritual and the like, about which it is difficult to say who are the more foolish—they who persist in these things or those who oppose them. But on the greater questions of intellectual freedom there is no question whatsoever. From men who would be her loyal children, who would attend her ministration and partake of her sacraments, she imposes no test, save the historical Apostles' Creed. If a man believe that, that is sufficient for full and complete membership of our Church. There may be expressions in our old-fashioned Prayer Book which you would hesitate to use. This must be so when we remember how long it is since the book underwent any revision. Well, you need not use them, and no man may deny you the title of Churchman for all that. It may be that about this and that miracle in the Bible you feel doubts, and are inclined to look upon them as parables, or the like. Even then, if you be lowly in heart and walking with God, you may still be a loyal Churchman. It may be that concerning this and that book of the Bible you have considerable doubt. You may have read that some of them were written at a later age than you had supposed, and by other men than was commonly believed. Still, if your heart be set on righteousness, you need not trouble concerning these things.

And if our Church—a fraction of the Great Church of God—is so tolerant, what shall we say of that great Church in God's sight? We brand men as unorthodox, atheists, agnostics, and the like. We call down an anathema on those who deny our position. But He tells us somewhat different. "Wherewith shall I come? He hath shewed thee."

Lastly, remember that the true avenue to the Divine is the moral, not the mere intellectual. It is not whether you could see a miracle, or whether you believe a miracle, but he that doeth the will of God it is that knoweth the doctrine concerning God.

If you will submit your will to His who loved you and bought you with a price; if you will steadfastly set your face against the evil within and around you; if you will cast yourself for pardon

and acceptance upon His great, all-embracing love, then you will never find Him fail you. "If with all your hearts ye truly seek Me . . . God." And, finding Him, you will find the secret of the blessed life, for He will give you peace—not as the world giveth, not in that way, but a peace deep and abiding, which never faileth. It is the gift of Him who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

FUNERAL REFORM.

By the Rev. F. LAWRENCE, Founder and Hon. Secretary of the Burial Reform Association.

Sermon Preached in Canterbury Cathedral.

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it."—Ecclesiastes xii. 7.

THAT much-loved form! How dear in life: how beautiful in death, with that peculiar beauty which distinguishes the recently dead. You will not permit it to suffer indignity and injury by too long exposure to the air, nor will you by cruel and unnecessary delay mar your last recollection of that ineffable beauty. Therefore you will give it prompt burial, and your endeavour will be to give it back effectually to that kindly, motherly earth whence it came, and of whose substance it is. So the coffin will be of the simplest, and such as shall speedily perish, that the earth may exercise upon the body its beneficent action. And this is what will happen: Through the earth above the air will filter, and when it reaches the body will resolve it into new and harmless products, which will rise through the earth above in air; and when some years have passed away the body will have literally risen again, and naught remain but harmless inorganic matter. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was."

For the funeral ceremonial itself call in the Christian principles of Faith, Hope, and Love.

Faith.—Doubtless, there will be heartfelt sorrow on the part of those who are left behind, for this is natural and scriptural. "Jesus wept" as He stood by the open grave of His friend Lazarus. But instead of the unmeaning pomp and dismal pageantry which obtain in some parts of this island, and the conventional exhibition of fashionable mourning attire, which neither mitigate grief nor manifest respect for the dead, there will be the outward manifestation of the Christian principle of faith—faith in the Father, "whose love is as great as His power, and neither knows limit nor end." Faith in the Son Who hath made known a full and free salvation to all who truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel. Faith in the Holy Spirit, whose gifts are joy, peace, love. Oh, the boundless love of the Most High! It is He Who gave; it is He Who hath taken away. Can we not add, "Blessed be the name of the Lord." To yield to inordinate grief is to dishonour God. Faith in God and zeal in the work He has given us to do on earth will make the poignancy of our grief to pass away.

Hope.—If we had no hope we might darken the house, clothe all in black—even the little children—plume the hearse with black feathers, drape the cemetery chapel in black, and encase the coffin in black; for black is the symbol of despair. We might spend much money, for this was the pagan way of striving to allay the pangs of despair which rent the soul. Or we might do our utmost to preserve the body, for this is supposed to comfort those who look not beyond the grave. All this if there were no hope. But thank God there is hope for the Christian. Christ came to bring light, life, and immortality. Christ died and was buried; on the third day death could not hold Him. He stood on the earth alive again. He hath overcome death; therefore death is dead to all who have lived to Him here on earth. The soul of the departed one is in the loving keeping of Him Who hath the key of Paradise. The body that we lay in the grave in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life is in the loving keeping of Him Who hath the key of the grave. Therefore we use flowers, which we cull from our own gardens—emblems of the infinitely varied and tender love of God: emblems also of the resurrection; and we sing a psalm or a hymn; and we do not place on the grave the pagan urn, nor the broken column, but some simple symbol expressing Christian hope.

Love.—Love manifests itself towards the departed, the bereaved, the bearers, the neighbours and poorer brethren. Love for the departed one suggests that regard be had to his wishes with respect to the avoidance of all ostentatious and expensive arrangements, that the greatest reverence be paid to the body, and that, wherever possible, relations or immediate friends perform the last offices and bear him to his burial, as "devout men bore Stephen to his burial," that no attempt be made to preserve the body in coffins of imperishable wood; and that there be no brick grave or vault, but that the body be placed in simple earth, to return naturally to the earth, whence it came—"Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust." Love to the bereaved suggests that there be no intrusion upon their sorrow, but that friends meet at the church or cemetery rather than at the house of mourning, and take no part in feasting and treating.

Love for the neighbours and poorer brethren suggests that simplicity, economy, and good taste be observed in every detail. Recognising the fact that ostentation is repugnant to the higher feelings, the rich would think of others when they bury their own dead, and would prove by their example that the exercise of economy is no evidence of want of respect, or of love; and, instead of lavishing much

upon coffin, funeral ceremonial, and mourning apparel, they would show their respect for the dead by some gift which would benefit the living, some gift to God's church, some gift to His poor.

Thus have I striven to rob death of some of his terrors; thus have I striven to put him before you as the "gate of life," towards which we should look with intense interest and hopeful trustfulness.

> Jesus lives, no longer now.
> Can thy terrors, Death, appal us?

This should be the aspect of our mind when we look forward to death:—

> As when one layeth
> His worn-out robes away,
> And, taking new ones, sayeth,
> "These will I wear to-day."
>
> So putteth by the spirit
> Lightly its garb of flesh,
> And passeth to inherit
> A residence afresh.

While we thus learn the true character of death to the Christian, it behoves us to take well to heart that this view of death can be held only by those who are humble, faithful followers of Christ, and who are day by day turning from sin and reaching forth to the perfect man which is in Christ Jesus. To him who is in sin death is, indeed, the king of terrors. Indeed, he who is yielding to sin is dead already.

The wilful sinner is in the blackness of darkness of his own creating, with God blotted out. This, the death of sin, is to be feared with an awful fear—the death of sin, the loss of all that is beautiful, and good, and God-like. Oh, to be delivered from this death!

But that other death—as a revered Archbishop said recently: "Do you Christian people regard this death as a spectre? If so, go up to it, and you will find it only a spectre after all." Turn ye, truly, from your sin and believe with all your heart in the Lord Jesus Christ and follow Him, and the life which has been begun in you shall open out into a life of eternal bliss with God. Heaven has begun in you already, and when death approaches you may utter with confidence the sublime defiance, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" And may add also, "Thanks be to God Who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord."

On Wednesday week, at the Feast of the Epiphany, at eleven o'clock, the customary offering of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, was made on behalf of the Queen at the Chapel Royal, St. James's Palace. Sir S. Ponsonby-Fane and the Hon. Aubrey FitzClarence, Gentlemen Ushers-in-Waiting, attended and presented her Majesty's gift. The Bishop of London, Dean of the Chapels Royal, officiated, assisted by the Rev. E. W. Kempe, Priest-in-Ordinary to the Queen, and the Holy Communion was celebrated.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 16, 1892.

CHRISTIANITY ABROAD.

THE charge of hypocrisy is frequently brought against Englishmen in foreign countries. Hypocrisy is, unfortunately, a plant of common growth, and we can only hope that England is not more cursed with it than other lands; more's the pity when Englishmen themselves try to prove otherwise.

Unluckily, to use a mild word, this has been going on in Persia. Last week we printed an article on the "Shah's tyranny"; it is time now to say, since what we printed then has been confirmed by all the papers, that the "Shah's tyranny" is only another word for "English hypocrisy." It is an unsavoury confession. Here are the facts.

The Shah's reason has gone, or is going fast; he is entirely in the hands of his Ministers, who are such as we should expect under the circumstances. The state of things which allowed Caligula to threaten to make his horse consul still exists in the Shah's dominions; and if that exalted despot has not approved the choice of Caligula, it is only because he has selected animals of less nobility and intelligence. These venal, illiterate beggars on horseback, with no knowledge of politics or statecraft, or anything in the world but their own self-interest, govern the country in the Shah's name; they know their time is short, and that when the Shah goes they will go with him, and that makes them doubly anxious to make hay while the sun shines.

At first blush this does not concern the English; but when it is considered that we have accredited Ministers to this miserable Court, and that our Ministers have gained the confidence of the people by extorting from the Shah a firman guaranteeing life and property among his subjects, then it is

plain that it concerns us very much. Here we have the Persian nation trusting to us to enforce the firman which we procured, and which is now treated, to the knowledge of our Ministers, as a dead letter. Meanwhile the English nation, aware of the firman and ignorant of the real facts, trusts to its Ministers and turns a deaf ear to reports which contradict their assurances and virtually impugn their good faith, and which, nevertheless, are quite true. Can we wonder if the Persians look upon us as a nation of hypocrites?

Unfortunately this is not all. One of the most infamous acts of rapacity ever contemplated has almost brought about a revolution in Persia—the Tobacco Monopoly. To any English business man the word "Monopoly" will be enough. When to a scheme vicious in itself are added the extra vices of being conceived in foreign interests and put into operation through wholesale bribery of venal Ministers and a half-mad king, the hostility of the Persian people to the Tobacco Régie will be sufficiently explained.

The Persians belong to the creed of Islam; they would be included among those for whom, with some assurance, we offer up a collect on behalf of "all Jews, Turks, infidels and heretics." Would it be surprising if they were to retaliate with an appeal for all "Englishmen, Christians and hypocrites?" Does not our Christianity stink in the nostrils of these Moslem men who see in Christians only double-faced politicians who take credit for reforms which they do not carry out, who talk about liberty and progress, but think of nothing else but how to make large profits out of keeping things as they are? Such infamous conventions as the Tobacco Régie, entered into with the full knowledge and sanction of our Ministers, forced upon the country, in defiance of law, treaties, traditions and religion itself by threats actually carried out in many cases of the bowstring and the bastinado, and finally abrogated only by an armed outbreak in which lives were lost and revolution was risked—such acts as this, conceived and carried out by Englishmen and professing Christians, must make us pause when we are inclined to enlarge upon our own national merits and religious excellence. It is not true that all Englishmen are hypocrites and that all Christians are insincere, but if that is the point of view taken at present by any patriotic Persian he has at all events some reason for the faith that is in him, or the want of it.

THE committee of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews for some time have contemplated extending their "Hebrew Missionary College," in Palestine Place, Hackney. On October 1st the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams was appointed head of the London Mission and Principal of the College, and during last quarter additional work was begun in the metropolis.

UNITY—UNITY—UNITY.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE WEST NORFOLK CLERICAL SOCIETY BY THE REV. H. G. ROSEDALE, M.A., VICAR OF MIDDLETON, NOVEMBER 8TH, 1891.

CHRISTIANITY has for every day life no more impressive command than "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." If the story of the good Samaritan has done nothing else, it has at least quickened neighbourly sympathies, moved to acts of mercy, and filled the world with institutions of charity. There may, however, be a fair discharge of our neighbourly obligation on the positive side, while our duty not to hinder others may be quite disregarded. St. Paul himself had this in mind when he expressed himself willing "to suffer all things lest we should hinder the Gospel of Christ." We feel deeply, I am sure, that in the face of so much difficulty the Church should at least present a common front, and that any damage done to any other brother must wound our blessed Head. Coming as I do from town work with only that experience of a town clergyman's difficulties, I have necessarily found this question of more prominent interest than would be felt by those who have had a long experience of country work. For instance, in towns great damage may be done where one clergyman crowds upon the territory of another, or where one vicar aggressively or slyly steals away the supporting strength of another church. Such actions must necessarily weaken the cohesion of our church, and surely it is in its oneness principally that it may look for strength; but there are also other means which are sometimes perhaps through thoughtlessness, perhaps from other motives made the sure means of injuring individual clergy, and through them our beloved Church as a whole, and of these I think there is none that so thoroughly does the work of destruction as that of ill-advised utterances from the pulpit.

The injury is unobtrusive and indirect, not in every case may it be intentional, nay, there may be instances where it is done with a good motive, while all the while it is doing harm more or less serious. I mean, for instance, that one clergyman may do immense damage by preaching an emasculated Gospel, encouraging a low type of piety or expressing such views of religion as give aid and comfort to those of "the contrary part." I have often noticed in town parishes which have known a very low degree of zeal it has been possible to point to surrounding churches where zeal was denounced as if it were fanaticism. Many a man after preaching for years earnestly, fervently, and tenderly has had to ask himself why his words have failed to arouse and touch, and by the help of the Holy Spirit to transform large numbers. May not the suggestion find a place that there were other causes than personal inadaptability. He feels that there should be scores seen seeking the way of life. Instead, there is here and there a traveller seen entering the straight gate. What is it that hinders? Many things, but perhaps not least amongst them the fact, that the air of such a neighbourhood echoes with conflicting voices uttering the great verities.

One clergyman lays stress on the outward accompaniments of devotion, and his neighbour refers to this as "empty and superstitious teachings." One man emphasises the need of a new heart, and then some one hard by makes light of such a doctrine as

belonging to a period of old and exploded dogmas. Transfer yourself, if possible, to one of the centres of civilised life, and imagine yourself labouring for Christ amidst a large population. Those who are in your church Sunday by Sunday hear tender and solemn admonition on the need of making peace with God by obtaining pardon and peace through Christ's atoning Blood, but one Sunday we will suppose they go to a neighbouring church. There the preacher pours ridicule on the "old doctrines," as he calls them, criticises the preaching of a "bloody theology" and expatiates on the love of the Father, while that vicarious sacrifice is mocked as an immoral theology, this man too mildly objects to the antiquated way that used to be of making much of death. To his ear the Gospels, have little to say of the next life. His Bible magnifies the duty of doing well to-day with the assurance that the Lord will provide for the future. He deprecates the use of the future world as an argument to urge to better living in the present. In his opinion we know too little about the next world to venture our views concerning it.

All this may not concern us, but I am fain to believe that there is hardly any clergyman who must not always be on his guard against the subtle influence of a spirit of antagonism—a spirit which must ultimately absorb a very great portion of his being, and which will almost necessarily show its effect in his teachings. Some sermons are almost entirely constituted of bitter satires, and yet, when you come to examine the points of difference, the *casus belli* invariably turns out to be what one of our members has aptly described as the "infinitely little." Here on the one hand is the High Churchman delighting himself by holding up to ridicule what he terms the lazy irreverence of those who do not happen to use his own shibboleth, whilst on the other hand many a so-called ultra-Evangelical has little time to spare for his flock, so busy is he in his attempts to foster persecution against his brother in holy orders who fails to see things in his somewhat shaded light, and as you hear him preach you feel that the most pressing matter in which each soul should be engaged is in the mortal conflict between two parts of the same body, both of whom acknowledge that one of the principles of their existence is to love one another. Is it to be wondered at that as long as pulpit vies with pulpit and preacher volleys forth denunciations against preacher, however subtly worded, and however nicely covered, the world at large must fail to recognise the essential unity of the Church, and as a consequence to throw in its allegiance? It may be suggested that evils of antagonistic teachings are confined to the area of the Church only, but this is not all. Such teachings echo outside and clash in every instance with the clear call so characteristic of every earnest and thoughtful clergyman, and so make confusion worse confounded. Is it any wonder under these circumstances that much spiritual power falls apparently with so little effect upon the people? It should not be a surprise. As much as an iceberg at sea sends a chill for many miles around it, reducing the warm gulf stream almost to iciness, so a cold, critical, and careless pulpit chills a neighbourhood. It is nearly impossible for a minority of churches to be surrounded by a majority which happens to hold low and eliminated theories of theology, and christian life, and to do better than hold their own. On the other hand, one church which is striving might and main for the common good of a common Church may do an immensity of good. I am sure I may be pardoned, as an example of my meaning, if I state that in my opinion there is not a single clergyman in the whole of this neighbourhood who will not greatly benefit by the revival of real vitality in one of our Lynn churches. As soon however as the pulpit begins to elevate the preacher at the cost of his message, so soon, in my humble opinion, does the pulpit become a weapon in the hands of the enemy. How many men there are in the present day who preach views so derogatory to the great themes of Christian truth, that unbelievers say of them, "He is my man," "That is the style of preaching which suits me." If Christ's words, "Woe unto you when men speak well of you" have any weight, how much more grave is their application to those who preach doctrines such as please those particularly who reject all claims of Christ over themselves. Almost every neighbourhood has known its "liberal" preacher. All the region rang with his praises. Society men, people who never went to church, were reported to hang on his beautiful sermons. But did it ever eventuate in anything much different from this, that after the novelty wore off, and the worldlings became weary, the audience declined, and the preacher departed further and further from the truth as it is in Christ Jesus? Meanwhile this end was being reached. All the surrounding parishes, and the Christian zeal of the neighbourhood, was suffering as only He knows who loved the Church and gave Himself for it.

Another word. The more I have thought over this subject the more firmly convinced I have become of the vast and unmeasurable importance of a greater interchange of sympathy among the clergy. Under present conditions it is not always easy, an effort is often required, but still I venture to believe that that effort will not be lost. In all this I cannot but feel my own shortcomings and want of brotherly charity, but nevertheless desire to press home, on my brethren as well as on myself, what by some may be termed a hobby, but which I firmly believe to be of paramount advantage to us in the work of winning and building up souls for our loving Lord and Saviour.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Sermon Bible." Vol. VIII., S. John iv., Acts vi. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

The new volume of this valuable series seems to be quite equal to the standard of its predecessors. We have found them very useful; we hope and expect to find this equally so.

And we would again remind our readers that these volumes are not coffins of skeletons—dry bones that never can live, but concentrations. You see the leading ideas in the writer's mind, and can think thereon for yourself.

"The Real Presence and Adoration in the Eucharist as taught, etc." A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, etc., by William Ince, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity. Oxford: Vincent, 1891.

In this sermon we have much negative teaching. We are warned against holding a material presence of a

Body confined to heaven, and against adoring the same. We are also taught that the language of the Fathers, though high-flown, like the hymns of Wesley, Dodridge, and Toplady, give no support to transubstantiation. When Eutyches asserted that one nature of our Lord absorbed the other, Fathers and Pope Gelasius maintained that, as in the Eucharist, one presence does not exclude the other. This is most satisfactoty ; but what we look in vain for in this sermon is an explanation of what is given to us *with* the bread. It will not do to rely on Hooker's words that the presence is to be sought only in the heart of the receiver. In other places Hooker bears out the doctrine of the Catechism, that the outward part is the means of conveying the inward grace, so that the grace must first be with the bread, which conveys it to us. People may try to mystify us and run away from Romish teaching. But the Catechism says plainly that the grace is with the bread before it is found in our hearts. The learned author names the text in 1 Corinthians x. 16, which says that the bread which we break is the communicating, or the dividing among ourselves, of the Body of Christ. For our part we prefer the translation communicatory, but taking the other version, there must be something divided or communicated. What is that something? St. Paul calls it the Body of Christ. If that material Body is confined to heaven, then it follows that what St. Paul calls the Body must be the grace from that Body, as the sun, from a distance, conveys to us its light, heat, attracting, electric, and photographing powers. It will not do to press from Hooker that there is no presence except in the heart. The Catechism says that before it reaches the heart it is with the bread ; and St. Paul says that it is communicated, or divided to us, before it is in our hearts. No doubt the learned author could satisfactorily explain the Catechism, and St. Paul and Hooker also. We regret that he has not done so in this sermon, which seems to sacrifice, at the shrine of Hooker, both the Catechism and St. Paul himself.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE MASORETIC NOTES TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—The reader of the Old Testament in Hebrew finds here and there notes in the margin and elsewhere. They are in Rabbinnic Hebrew, and were made chiefly by the Masorites. The Buxtorfs did much to elucidate this branch of learning. We propose in this paper to make a few observations on these notes so as to put the English reader in possession of their nature, as they explain much of what the text was in the time the Masorites undertook their very laborious task. Our ordinary English version makes nothing whatever of them, although there are many thousands of them, of one sort or another, in many of the Hebrew Bibles. But let us inquire first who the Masorites were, and what was the nature of their work?

The Targumists and Masorites form a distinct order in the Jewish literature—the former the paraphraists, the latter the expounders of the sacred books. The chief Targumist Onkelos was strangely enough an alien, called by the Jews Onkelos Hagger—the stranger. The Babylonian Talmud declares that he lived about the time of the Saviour. The Masorites were in a sense the expounders of Scripture. In its widest meaning, Masora means tradition from *masar* to deliver. Both Masora and Kabala are used to denote tradition, differing in this respect: Masora referred to the text or letter of the inspired writings, Kabala to the mystical or theosophic doctrines of Judaism. It is thus then we are indebted to the Masorites, the labour they bestowed on the text and letter was immense—nearly incredible. It was the labour of Westcott and Hort magnified many times over, because the work of the Masorites extended over some ages. The rabbis of Tiberias even went so far as to count the letters of the Hebrew Bible, and they laboured in the creation of a grammatical apparatus which would certify the true text of the holy volume. The whole number of letters is stated to be 815,280. This, however, is believed to be only an approximate calculation. They made notes of places where they believed words or letters had been altered, omitted, or interpolated. They notice where a letter has been made larger or smaller than it should be. In Psalm lxxx., 14th verse, there is an ע suspended, because it is said this is the middle letter of the Old Testament. The Masoretic note there, is that it is suspended. Now it is clear that all this must have been immense labour. And there is no doubt that, however much the Jews have perverted certain parts of Scripture in their expositions, they have been great conservators of the text itself. A Jew would rather die than corrupt the text itself. Maimonides gives some remarkable details on this point. Before a Jew would inscribe the divine names on his MSS. he had always to undergo a rather laborious ritual. These names were seven in number, Eheyeh, Yehovah, Shadai, Zebaoth, El, Elohim, Elohikem.

One of the greatest, if not the greatest, of their works was the invention of the vowel points. The ancient mode of writing Hebrew was with radicals only. While it was a leading language this would be no difficulty. Just as an Englishman now would have little or no difficulty in reading words where the vowels had been left out. Some think the vowels were invented by Ezra, others think that they were invented much later.

The controversy raged long. Buxtorf, father and son, took a leading part in it. So far it has not been settled. But the importance of these vowel points in the matter of interpretation is immense ; and so we are to a large extent yet under the influence of these Masorites, as the same radicals may represent a dozen different meanings according as they are punctuated. Now let us examine a few of these notes.

The Pentateuch had long been divided into *sidras* for Sabbath readings, almost as far back as Moses, some think. There are 54 of these. But the Masorites of Tiberias carried out this system of division to the other books of the Old Testament, and added also a more minute analysis. At the end of each book an enumeration is given of the number of verses, chapters, etc., notified by a particular word or words which comprise the numerals making up the amount Thus at the end of Genesis we find this note. The number of the verses of the book of Genesis is 1,534, of which the sign is אֵל לֵךְ. The middle of the book occurs in Gen. xxvii. 40 : "By thy sword shalt thou live." Its greater sections are 12, פרשיות, marked פ פ or ס ס ס, of which the symbol is זה as read in

Exodus iii. 15 : "This is my memorial for ever." The Masoretic chapters are 43, of which the sign occurs, Gen. xxvii. 33, גם : "Also thou shalt be blessed." And its chapters (at that time in use) are 50, of which the symbol is לך, Isaiah xxxiii. 2 : "Lord, be gracious to us, לך, to Thee we look." The number of its open sections is 43, of the closed sections 48, altogether 91, which number is denoted by a symbol in Exodus xi, 8, צא : "Go thou, and all the people which are at thy feet." This is the Masoretic note. But it requires some explanation. The parashioth or greater divisions are marked off by פפפ or סססּ. The sedarim or lesser division by ס. The perakim or chapters by Hebrew numerals, the pesikim or verses, are marked out into sections of five verses each. The open sections are those which commence at the beginning of a line, the closed sections those which commence in the middle of the line. As to the total number of verses, 1,534, I may say I have added them up several times and can find them only 1,533. The verses in our English Bibles correspond to the Hebrew, except in two chapters, xxxi. and xxxii. The Hebrew has fifty-four and thirty-three verses each, the English fifty-five and thirty-two. How this deficiency of one occurs I am unable to say; perhaps some of your readers can. It was no doubt correct at the time the note was made. It is no doubt incorrect now.

Neither does the middle answer to Gen. xxvii. 40 as at present divided. The middle of the book would be at the end of verse 767 ; Genesis xxvii. 40 is 768.

The same style of note occurs at the end of the other books. The number of verses of Exodus is stated to be 1,209. The middle of the book Exodus xxii. 27, others say 28. The greater sections are 11. The other sections 29. The open division 69 and the closed 95—altogether, 164. So also after Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, we have similar notes. At the end of Deuteronomy, however, we have in addition a summary of the whole Pentateuch. The pesikim or verses are given as 5,845, the open sections 290, the closed 370—total, 669. The other books of the Old Testament have been dealt with in the same way.

Besides these summaries there are numerous other notes chiefly textual but some exegetical.

The Hebrew verses are ended by a Silluk with a Soph-pasuk, which answers to our full stop. But 28 verses are enumerated where there is a pause after the *athnach*. The termination of such places is abrupt; and something is wanting to complete the senses. The Masorites here append a note to the effect: "There is a pause or hiatus in the middle of the verse," the athnach answers to a semicolon. Take one or two examples. Genesis xxxv. 22 : this records Reuben's sin. There are two athnachs in the verse and a lacuna, as if some word or words had been lost. Our version supplies "*it*." The LXX. insert the words *καὶ πόνηρον ἐφάνη ἐνάντιον αὔτου*. There is even an open division in the middle of the verse. Are there any words lost here? Did Jacob make use of any language when he heard of Reuben's sin, or was he struck with astonishment which no words could convey?

In 1 Sam. xiv. there are two such pauses, at verses 19 and 36. That after verse 36 is the most abrupt. In all these places where the hiatus occurs there is something rugged about the construction. The Masorites did not attempt to supply any words themselves.

The notes Keri and C'thiv are very numerous. In five passages Keri has עָנְיִים for עֲנִיִּים and twice Keri has עֲנִיִּים for C'thiv עָנְיִים, so we see the Masorites were not always consistent. Indeed, there is scarcely a page where some anomaly may not be found. In the Pentateuch נַעַר is used as if it were of common gender, yet it is everywhere corrected by the Masorites to נַעֲרָה twenty-two times in all. In Numbers x. 35, 36 we have an inverted Nun at the beginning and end of these verses. The Masoretic note is Nun inverted. The Rabbis say they are so placed because these verses have been taken out of their proper places.

There are, also, some 15 places where certain words are dotted above. In the law 10 times, in the prophets 4 times, in the Psalms once. The Masoretic note here is the word is dotted. Some of the Rabbinical explanations are rather curious. In Genesis xxxiii. 4, the word "and kissed him" is dotted, because Esau kissed Jacob without his consent. So in Genesis xxxvii. 12 the אֶת is dotted, and it is so dotted, say the Rabbis, because the sons of Jacob went, not to feed the flock, but themselves. These reasons are very puerile. Why these words are dotted may possibly have been to call particular attention to them, although we cannot always see the reason why.

Of the numerous words that have dropped out of the text and have been placed by note in the margin, these have been preserved by tradition, and placed there by the Masorites. Whether the correct word has always been preserved in the margin is an open question. Also in those cases where the incorrect word is in the text and the correct are placed in the margin, it shows the reluctance of the devout copyist to alter what was manifestly wrong. But how have these inaccuracies crept into the text and been allowed to remain there? When will the man, or men, arise to do for the Old Testament what Westcott and Hort have done for the new? When will the time arrive when it can be written of the Old Testament as Dr. Schaff wrote of the New Testament: "The 17th day of May, 1881, marks an epoch in the history of the New Testament. It is the birthday of the purest English translation and of the purest Greek text." The man to do this must have consummate ability, ample means, and make it a life work. I pointed out this a short time ago to a young man who had taken the highest classical honours at Oxford. True, there have been eminent Hebrew scholars — Kennicott, De Rossi, Lowth, Gesenius, the Buxtorfs, Etheridge, Boothroyd, Van Hooght, Walton, etc., who have each done, according to their talent and opportunity, something towards giving us a pure Hebrew text. But much remains to be done in collating, comparing, and in exercising a sound judgment in deciding the text. In God's good time the man and the means will arrive. The writer of this knows something of the difficulty. He has been for several years collecting materials for a revision of the Welsh Bible. As yet he has ventured to publish only very little on the subject. After much correspondence, and much comparing of the most ancient versions he can find the task is scarcely begun. He can only expect now, if God grants him life, to finish his labours in this respect probably in the dim twilight of some workhouse or another. *Esto sic, volo.*

O. F. S. P. J.

Edlington Rectory.

THE DECLARATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

SIR,—However much one may sympathise with the desire of thirty-eight clergymen to allay needless perplexity, and to check reckless and irreverent criticism, it is difficult to see how such a document is likely to have the smallest effect in attaining either of these aims. On the other hand, its vagueness in some places and its strong language in others are likely to create perplexity and to provoke intemperate rejoinders. It has drawn forth some valuable remarks; but the sum total of its results is likely to be decidedly evil. For, however good in intention, it is, in fact, a *bullying* document, an attempt to condemn by the *ipse dixits* of individuals (some of whom bear revered names) those who hold views which have never been declared by any competent authority to be untenable in the English Church. It is, moreover, an attempt to settle by authority (and that self-constituted) questions which can never be settled by *any* human authority. Questions of criticism as to the date, authorship, and integrity of books; the genuineness of readings, the truth of historical statements, the meaning of words, and the like, can be settled in one way, and in one way only—by finding the right answer and *proving* that it *is* the right answer.

It would almost seem as if Jeremy Taylor had some such document as this Declaration before him when he wrote:—

"This pretence of a necessity of humbling the understanding is none of the meanest arts whereby some persons have invaded, and have usurped power over, men's faith and consciences; and therefore we shall examine the pretence afterwards, and try if God hath invested any man, or any company of men, with such power. . . . . Scripture, tradition, councils, and fathers are the evidence in a question, but *reason is the judge;* that is, we being the persons that are to be persuaded, we must see that we be persuaded reasonably."—"Liberty of Prophesying," ii. 13, x. 5.

Something will be gained towards clearing up the vagueness, of which you and others have justly complained, if we are allowed to assume that, whatever this Declaration means, it is *not* meant to condemn the writings of Bishop Butler, or those of any of the persons who have signed it.

Bishop Butler has said:—

"Reason can, and it ought to, judge not only of the meaning, but also of the morality and the evidence of revelation. First, it is the province of reason to judge of the morality of Scripture, ... whether it contains things plainly contradictory to wisdom, justice, or goodness; to what the light of nature teaches us of God. . . . . Secondly, Reason is able to judge, and must, of the evidence of revelation, and of the objections urged against that evidence."—*Analogy*, Pt. II. ch. iii.

There is a good deal more to the same effect in this third chapter, for Butler is anxious not to seem "to vilify reason;" and it is not easy to save him in this matter from the condemnation which is implied in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Declaration.

Dean Goulburn has pointed out that "in one or two places, St. Stephen, quoting the Old Testament from memory, mixes together separate incidents." After giving instances of these mistakes he comments thus:—

"These features of the address . . . . serve to show two important points—one, that even the highest form of inspiration is not dictation; that the human mind (with its ordinary faculties of memory, imagination, and reasoning) is called into play, and not merely the pen or the organs of speech; and the other, that the highest form of inspiration consists with such apparent inaccuracies as do not in the least affect the ideas which have to be conveyed, or the great scope of the passage."

"The pernicious rationalism of the day . . . . is partly owing to the circumstance of Christians having surrounded the Bible with a superstitious or false reverence, and having *made claims for the Bible which the Bible never makes for itself.*"—*Acts of the Deacons*, Bk. I., ch. v.

This Declaration makes claims for the Bible which the Bible never makes for itself. What result may we expect?

In his valuable commentary on St. Matthew, Prebendary Sadler thus writes on Matt. xxvii. 9:—

"The difficulty respecting St. Matthew ascribing the quotation to the wrong prophet can only weigh with those who hold the narrowest view of verbal inspiration."

Inspiration—

"Was not vouchsafed to save him from slips of memory, which any ordinary reader of the New Testament can correct for himself. It may be that if we had his very autograph preserved to us we should find in it many such mistakes."

After mentioning some of the "ingenious conjectures" to explain away the mistake, he continues:—

"But is it not better to believe that the inspiration of the Evangelists was not given to save them from those natural mistakes of grammar, geography, citation, etc., into which all writers who are very full of their subject naturally fall?"

With similar wisdom he rejects the explanations of the discrepancies respecting the healing of Bartimaeus, and in commenting on Mark x. 46 writes as follows:—

"Is it not better to suppose that the inspiration of the Evangelists did not extend to minutiæ of this sort, and that there is a mistake in the narrative, and that either St. Luke on the one side, or St. Matthew and St. Mark on the other, were misinformed?"

All this is excellent; but how does it agree with the Declaration that the Scriptures "declare incontrovertibly the *actual historical truth* in *all* records?

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, January 3rd, 1892.

APOSTASY, JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN.

SIR,—I think the Jewish Church completed its apostasy, when it not only rejected our Lord as the Messiah, but also gave up all hope of a Messiah at all. Do not their words, "We have no king but Cæsar," amount to this? They terrified Pilate with the other words, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend; whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Cæsar." His own head might have fallen had such an accusation of him reached Rome. But the chief Priests, by the words quoted above, gave up all expectation of "the Hope of Israel." The fact that the Jewish Church denied Christ, and renounced even the hope of a Messiah, proves the falseness of the Roman *à priori* argument. It is this, if God gives a revelation and authorises expositors, it is impossible that men, through submission to these appointed ex-

positors, can err from the faith—this is Rome argument. The Jewish apostasy upsets this reasoning. When I once pressed this argument on a Romanist, his answer was amazing; he said the argument was not that God could not do so and so, but that Christ could not. I might have asked him was not Christ God, or was He a higher being than God, that what is possible for God is not possible for His higher perfections? But I refrained—we must not always answer a fool according to his folly.

Now, I very much fear that in our Revision Revolution we went near to a similar apostasy—I refer to our emasculation of the Athanasian Creed—I speak not of its exclusion from public worship, though I regret that it should be relegated to a place with the Articles. But what I refer to is the removal from that Catholic Creed, not only of all the Articles which treat of the mysterious relation of the Three Persons, but what is more astounding, of that verse which asserts that we must "believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." We see Pharisees and Sadducees joining in the renunciation of the hope of a Messiah. And now we see our Evangelicals, our Pharisees joining with our Freethinkers, our Sadducees, in making our Lord's incarnation an open question. We are now told plainly that no man is to be condemned for his want of faith, though our Lord says, "If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins." Here is a condemnation, whether the death refers to the ruin of Jerusalem or the final judgment. 1 John iii. 10 is as strong, "He that believeth not God, hath made Him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son." Does not the Athanasian Creed merely repeat all the items of this record? Was it not drawn up to meet all the heresies, as they arose, as to the eternal generation, as to the two natures, and one person, and as to our Lord's miraculous Incarnation? The removal of the several verses from the Athanasian Creed was a denial "of the record that God gave of His Son." This awful renunciation of the faith was made, alas! by all our then bishops except four—four of our existing bishops being of the number who signed it. But, thank God, better thoughts prevailed, and instead of emasculating the Creed, as at first proposed, it is left in its perfection, but banished from public worship. I speak not of any actual compact between our two parties—our Pharisees and our Sadducees. I speak not of a peace between Herod and Pontius Pilate. I speak not of truth being crucified between two thieves. Simple facts are better than any sensational description. The case is plain enough. Our Broad Church members knew well that our Baptismal Services are sound, and that the Regeneration in them means no change of nature, impossible to infants, and past with adults, but merely God's adoption and pardon. But still, to please the Evangelicals, they proposed an alternative service, which would make all the grace of baptism a right to call oneself legally a Christian. Thus much did our Sadducees to please our Pharisees, and the compliment was repaid. If Augustus gave up Cicero, Antony sacrificed his uncle. I am sure the Evangelicals had no scruples as to the assertions in the Athanasian Creed, of our Lord's nature as God and man, but they consented to remove them, in order to repay the philosophers for their help on the baptismal and other sacramental points. I do not think both parties equally criminal. I am sure that the Evangelicals knew not what they were agreeing to. I can pray, "Father forgive them, for they knew not what they did." But I cannot think thus of our philosophers; they knew very well, both as to the Baptismal Grace, which they were denying, and as to the inspiration of the prophets, and our Lord's infallibility, both of which they make nothing of. Of the prophets they say that "divers manners" means of different degrees of authority; and of our Lord they say that He was infallible, neither before His death nor even after His resurrection, so that He is really no authority at all. All this treats of Irish divinity, but really it concerns you fully as much as it does us. You have the very same two parties—the Evangelicals, or Pharisees, and the Broad Church, or Sadducees. And, in addition to these, you have a third party, which we were free from, the Romish party, which will try to alter the formularies in a Tridentine direction. We had no such people. We had only two parties, the Prayer Bookmen and the Revisionists. If ever you are set free by Disestablishment, you will have the three parties struggling round the dissecting table, upon which your Prayer Book will be thrown. It is well to be prepared for all contingencies and all combinations of parties. May God bring you through at least as well as He did us. If we have not wholly escaped, at least our scars are nothing compared with the wounds which will be inflicted on you in your struggle to save the faith from Rome, from Geneva, and from German infidelity.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—In reply to Mr. E. L., I hasten to say that "Frazer" should have been the famous "Travers," Hooker's opponent. There wa sa misprint. It was the Puritanically disposed Whitgift who rejected his Presbyterian orders. Possession, and Legal possession, are two different things.

THE Funeral Reform Association held its first monthly meeting on Thursday, the 7th inst., at the Church House, Westminster. Professor William R. Smith, Medical Officer London School Board, in taking the chair, said that he recognised with satisfaction the efforts of the Church in this most important educational movement. The Rev. F. Lawrence, honorary secretary, said undue retention of the body above ground and the use of durable coffins and vaults should be made illegal, and he believed that such friendly coercion would be generally welcomed. A resolution was passed recommending the appointment of a Minister of Health. Upon the motion of the Archdeacon of London, seconded by the Rev. R. Milburn Blakiston, it was resolved to invite the archbishops and bishops to sanction the use of an alternative service for the burial of little children in their respective dioceses. It was stated that the Bishop of London had contributed £5 to the Society's funds.

THE *Manchester Diocesan Directory for* 1892 shows that there are in the diocese 852 benefices, churches, chapels-of-ease, and licensed rooms, against 845 at the same date last year. The total number of clergy in the diocese, made up to the 9th inst., is 910, against 908 on the same date last year. There are also in the diocese 73 lay-readers, including three "lay evangelists." During the past year two benefices were vacated by resignation under the Incumbents' Resignation Act, 1871—viz., Newchurch-in-Rossendale, by the Rev. J. B. Phillips, and St. George's, Bolton, by

the Rev. Neville Jones, since deceased. In reference to church extension in the diocese, it appears that from 1848 to December 21, 1869, 110 new churches were consecrated by Bishop Prince Lee, the cost of the structures being £451,344. Twenty churches were built and consecrated in lieu of former churches, at a cost of £90,825. Further, 163 new district parishes and ecclesiastical districts were formed. During Bishop Fraser's reign nearly a million sterling was expended in the erection of 105 new churches and twenty-eight churches in lieu of former structures. During the same period 117 new district churches and ecclesiastical districts were formed. During Bishop Moorhouse's Episcopate there have been thirty-five new churches and chancels erected and consecrated, only one church having been consecrated this year—All Saints', North Moor, Oldham. During the year four churchyards have been consecrated. The total number of confirmees for the present year (exclusive of special confirmation in the cathedral on the 14th inst.) has been 16,117, against 13,564 last year. Of these confirmees 6,208 were males and 9,909 females. The clerical death-roll in the diocese for 1891 has been rather heavy, twenty-two in all.

A RELIGIOUS journal, published at Rome, *L'Evangelista* (Viâ Cavour, 57), remarks as follows :—"The course taken by the Peace Congress of Rome at its latest sitting should bring a blush to the face. Certainly we blush as Evangelicals and Italians. The following Motion was presented to the Congress by Dr. Evans Darby, Secretary of the English Peace Society, and Rev. Rowland Howard :—'Considering that the spirit of war is opposed to the precepts and example of the Spirit of Christ, this Congress appeals to all who bear the Christian name, and invites their cordial and active co-operation in order to prevent war and to render possible its complete disappearance from the earth.' To hear the words 'Christian,' and 'Christ,' was quite sufficient to put the Italian element, in the Congress, out of humour; and two Italians, Signor Contieras of Naples, who appealed to the ladies! and the Marquis Alfieri de Sostegno, in the name of 'the religion of humanity!' opposed the acceptance of the motion. It was of no effect that its proposers earnestly adhered to it; but at length its opposers clamorously prevented Dr. Darby from continuing his remarks. And it was of no effect that the President (Signor Bonghi) seeking to 'hold with the hare and run with the hounds' [in Italian, 'per salvare capra e cavolo,' that is, 'to save both the goat and the cabbage'], made a proposal to postpone this motion until the next Congress. For it was crushed out and extinguished by the vote of the Italians, with a number of the French-speaking members, and also with the aid of the ladies. And this result was received with tumultuous clapping! Several Evangelical Italian Ministers were present at the Congress, but none, no, not one, had the courage to come forward and speak, in order to give support to their two colleagues from England and America; or to point out that, as the Congress in its previous sittings had issued appeals for the popagandism of its ideas, to Parliaments, to Working Men's Associations, to Political Electors, to Schoolmasters, to Ladies, and others, it was but just to pay at least similar respect to the immense number of persons forming the universal Christian Church, with a view to enlist their co-operation, also for the attainment of the ideals of peace and fraternity. But not a single word further was breathed on behalf of this!"

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkinson, Rev. G. B., M.A.; Rector of Swanington, Norfolk.
Bagley, Rev. W. H. M., M.A., Curate of Combmartin; Vicar Pilton, Barnstaple.
Bickersteth, Rev. Montague Cyril, M.A., Pusey House, Oxford; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Oxford.
Burrows, Rev. Francis Robert, M.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Crowther, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Norton, Kent, Chaplain of Christ Church, Dieppe.
Dawson, Rev. Abraham, M.A., Rector of Seagoe, Portadown; Archdeacon of Dromore.
Doolan, Rev. Robert Reid Arthur, B.A.; Rector of Corscombe, and Perpetual Curate of Toller Whelme, Dorset, by dispensation.
Dunlop, Rev. William Buchanan; Vicar of Christ Church, Sayers Common, Sussex.
Gough, Rev. A. W., M.A., Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Jersey; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Wakefield.
Hall, Rev. Henry Owen, B.A., Senior Curate of the Cathedral of St. Nicholas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Vicar of Earsdon, Northumberland.
Hall, Rev. Walter, M.A., Curate; Vicar of Stainburn, near Otley.
Haynes, Rev. E. J., late Vicar of Little Marlow, Bucks; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chichester.
Jellicorse, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Clunbury, Ludlow; Prebendary of Wellington in Hereford Cathedral.
Johnson, Rev. H. R., M.A.; Warden of the Welsh Clergy School, Aberdare.
Kyle, Rev. John L., M.A., Curate of St. John's, Cardiff; Vicar of Hilton, near Yarm, Yorkshire.
Marshall, Rev. Walter, M.A., Minor Canon of St. George's Chapel, Winsdor; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Oxford.
Mayhew, Rev. Cyril, London Secretary of the Pastoral Order of the Holy Ghost, and late Curate of St. Saviour's, Paddington; Chaplain, Bombay.
Methuen, Rev. St. John Frederick Charles, B.A.; Rector of Puncknowle, Bridport.
Phipps, Most Hon. and Rev. Constantine Charles Henry, M.A., Marquis of Normanby, Canon of St. George's Chapel, Winsdor; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Oxford.
Roberts, Rev. Ellis (Elis Wyn o Wyrfai), Rector of Llangwm, near Corwen; Honorary Canon of St. Asaph Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baynham, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar, Canon of Netheraven in Salisbury Cathedral, and Rural Dean of the Patterne Portion, at Bishop's Lavington Vicarage, on the Feast of the Epiphany, aged 73.
Beckles, Rev. Henry McLeod, Rector of Heene, son of Dr. Beckles, formerly Bishop of Sierra Leone, on the 6th inst., aged 45.
Burmester, Rev. George, M.A., for sixty-one years Rector of the parish, at the Rectory, Little Oakley, on the 9th inst., aged 97.
Cope, Rev. Sir William Henry, Bart., of Bramshill, at Lennox Tower, Southsea, on the 7th inst., aged 80.
Davies, Rev. John Hamilton, M.A., F.R.S., for eighteen years Rector of St. Nicholas, Worcester, on the 2nd inst.
Dixon, Rev. Robert, D.D., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Rugby, Hon. Canon of Worcester, at St. Matthew's Vicarage, on the 8th inst., aged 86.
Freeling, Rev. George Noel, Fellow of Merton College, Hon. Canon of Christ Church, and Vicar of St. Cross, Holywell, at Merton College, Oxford, on the 10th inst., aged 62.
Morgan, Rev. Lewis, M.A., Rector of the parish for thirty-six years, and of the parish of Eglwysbrewis about forty years, at the Rectory, St. Hilary, near Cowbridge, Glamorganshire, on the 7th inst.
Nickson, Rev. Abraham Augustus, formerly Rector of Clonkeen, county Louth, Ireland, at the Hydropathic Establishment, Baslow, on the 4th inst., aged 80.
Streeter, Rev. Charles Ernest, at Hedworth Vicarage, East Boldon, on the 2nd inst.
Younghusband, Rev. Lewis Edward, at Eastbourne, on the 5th inst., aged 35.

The Church of England Pulpit.

NATIONAL MOURNING.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A. Hon. Canon of Manchester.

Sermon on the Death of Prince Albert Victor.

"All Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah. And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah: and all the singing men and singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day, and made them an ordinance in Israel: and, behold! they are written in the lamentations."—2 Chron. xxxv. 24, 25.

THIS text speaks of the national mourning of the Jews for the death of King Josiah. That death happened at a time when all the hopes of the nation were bound up in the life of one single man. Israel was then cut very short: ten of the tribes were already gone, and only Judah and little Benjamin left. It was a very feeble nation, bandied about like a shuttlecock between the two great empires of Babylon and Egypt. All its hopes were centred on the family of David, and in that family the only remaining man of character and power had been king Josiah, of whom the men of prophetic minds who could forecast the future spoke as "the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, of whom we said, Under his shadow we shall live among the heathen" (Lam. iv. 20). This king had made what we should now call a mistake in policy: he had interfered in the great contest between Babylon and Egypt, had attacked the King of Egypt, when he had not adequate power to resist him, and had thus brought about his own defeat and death. When he was killed, all hope for Israel ended. Though the great catastrophe was delayed for twenty-two more years, and four of his children and grand-children sate upon his throne, yet all these were feeble men without courage or sense of duty, who reigned in the spirit expressed in the proverbial saying, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." After them no temporal king of the house of David has ever reigned; and their only successor on the throne of Israel has been that King, whose earthly throne was a cross, and His crown a crown of thorns, though of His spiritual kingdom we Christians believe there shall be no end. No wonder that the mourning over Josiah was very bitter and very sincere, especially to men like Jeremiah, who had an eye opened to foresee the future. It was, in great part, a selfish sorrow, for while the people mourned over the pitiable fate of poor Josiah, they grieved still more over what they feared was about to happen to themselves.

In our national mourning for the young Prince who has so suddenly been taken away, there is hardly any of this selfish feeling. Our Royal Family is blessed with a large progeny of strong, vigorous, healthy children, who have been carefully trained to know that their high position entails upon its possessors a life of active and conscientious duty—an obligation to live for the people, and not for themselves. Exceptions may, no doubt, be found in their conduct, in which the love of pleasure, sharpened by the excessive tediousness of a life of parade without real power, has seemed to produce occasional forgetfulness of duty. But, in their general lives, our Royal Family has submitted, with excellent grace and self-sacrificing devotedness, to the heavy burden which lies upon them, and has done their duty to the nation nobly.

Some of our friends among the working class think that their own lives are hard, and those of persons in exalted positions easy, and that these are having all the good things of life, while they themselves—poor Lazaruses—have nothing but the evil ones. But I believe that, if men's inward feelings could be inspected and analysed, it would be found that those who are placed by divine Providence on thrones, or closely connected with them, are the least to be envied of all human beings, and that the man who deserves most pity of all now living in Europe, is its one remaining despotic emperor. Certainly thrones are now no easy lounging-chairs, and all crowns are more or less crowns of thorns. So we think that our Royal Family has a very difficult part to play, and that it has played it nobly, and has thus deserved a people's respect and love.

Since the family is thus numerous and strong, and since there is another son of equal promise to step into the vacant place, we find no cause on the present occasion for a selfish sorrow excited by a consideration of our own national or personal interests, like that of the Jews over King Josiah. Instead of this, our feelings are moved by a simple story of family bereavement, such as might have happened in any labourer's family, just as in that of a Prince. Here was a young man, amiable and dutiful, full of youthful promise, with a life of happiness and usefulness before him, dear to his father and mother, dear to his sisters and brothers, dearer still to the one who was to become his wife, the day of his marriage fixed, and all in preparation for the one high festival of human life. Then all this earthly happiness is cast down at a blow: and the funeral comes instead of the wedding. All classes alike can sympathise with the sorrow of the family, and especially with the still harder trial of the one that is left behind as a maiden widow, the bride of the dead.

I think it not amiss on an occasion like this to

remind the people from the pulpit of the benefits which they derive from Royalty as an institution, which they often fail to perceive, and for which they are not sufficiently grateful. We cannot say that we depend on our kings as entirely as the Jews did on the house of David, and especially upon poor King Josiah. There are now such things in the world as well-governed republics—one, at least, beyond the Atlantic, which is about to celebrate its hundredth year of life and unbroken prosperity. But, in general, institutions based merely on the popular will have not the stability of those which are also held to be given by the providential act of God. And all such have this terrible defect, that they are eaten through and through with the canker-worm of electioneering. No country district is now so retired as to be exempt from the eager canvass for votes. And few persons can be so unobservant, that they fail to notice the demoralising effect which that practice has both on the politicians who desire to be elected, and on the electors who are solicited to vote for them. These encourage in each other but a too natural egotism, preaching or pursuing sectional interests instead of the general good. And, instead of always speaking out the truth, whether popular or no, candidates veil and distort it, and electors love to have it so. Now the good of Royalty is that it raises the chief representative of the national power and dignity above the reach of these base practices. It secures for us one person and one family in the country who are exempt from the degrading necessity of cajoling the people in order to obtain their votes. It also leaves to us some one to look up to, who is admitted to be above ourselves. We look upon our kings and queens as superior authorities, whom we did not choose, but received as a gift from God. In that respect they closely resemble that other superior authority, which is most certainly of God's own institution—the father and the mother. We know very well that however great may be the progress of democracy, and the prevalence of elective representative institutions, there never can come a time when the children will be able to elect the man and woman whom they prefer to accept as their father and mother. The royal authority resembles in this respect the parental one. We did not choose it; but God gave it to us, just as He gave us our fathers and mothers. And we respect it because it is His gift. As for creatures of our own appointment, whom we make and unmake, elect and reject—we never can respect them as we do those whom we believe to be gifts of God. Therefore, we trust that the time may never come, either for us or for our posterity, when the queen or king, reigning by the grace of God, shall be replaced in England by an elective president.

But perhaps we may be accused of degenerating into politics—a subject which (we are told) ought specially to be avoided by those who have to speak in pulpits. Let us return to our own higher themes.

The blow that has been struck is from the hand of God. It was utterly unexpected, like many other such blows which have fallen both on ourselves and on our neighbours. It seems to man's eyes a terrible misfortune both for the immediate sufferers, and for the country which is so much interested in them. But we can see partly how it may be blessed both to them and to ourselves. Many of us know what happens in that family circle out of which God has taken a beloved and dutiful child. There is a place in the home vacant, and one in the churchyard filled. But the one that is gone out of sight is happy and safe; causes no more cares, no more anxieties, no more fears. After the first wound that that departure caused there can never come another wound from that child. The present is very painful; but the future is, and must continue bright. And the presence remains real, though henceforth invisible. It is not and never can be lost. And the tie to the other world thus created, has an abiding effect on those who are left behind. All, whether in high or low estate, have faults and sins which need chastening; they have been, in points, unworthy of their position, and unfaithful to their vocation. Nothing can remind them of this more surely than the longing that remains behind for "the touch of the vanished hand, and for the sound of the voice that is still!"

We, the people of this country, have decidedly needed chastening. In all classes of life there has been too much selfishness. And, in the few latest years, the jealousies between class and class, fomented by ambitious and disappointed men, have been tending to produce dangerous breaches and confusions in the State. A national visitation like the present may inspire all classes with gentler and less selfish feelings, may teach all to turn from party warfare, and to study the things which make for peace, by which we may no longer promote the interests of self or class, but the welfare of those who are not ourselves. We may be reminded of our solidarity (as it is sometimes called), that we are all of one body and one blood, with the same human nature, and liable to the same sufferings. Our family blessings are as precarious as those of the Royal Family, and our circle might be broken just like theirs. It has been broken for some of us many a time. So let us feel for them, and mourn for them, and pray, as we have already prayed today, that the only true Comforter may comfort them, and overrule this heavy blow for their, and for the nation's, good.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, First Lord of the Admiralty, has accepted the office of trustee to the St. Andrew's Waterside Church Mission, a position which was held for some years by the late Mr. W. H. Smith.

THE MINISTRY OF ANGELS.

By the Rev. J. REID, Rector of Newtown-saville.

Sermon Preached on Sunday, November 22nd, 1891.

"And there came a messenger unto Job."—Job i. 14.

JOB, from whom this Book derives its name, is supposed to have lived before the days of Moses, though the time cannot now be fixed with absolute certainty. No name distinguished for piety is mentioned between the death of Joseph and the time of Moses, unless it be Job, of whom God said, "There is none like him in all the earth." The book of Job is perhaps the oldest in existence, having been written several centuries before the earliest productions of Grecian genius. There is great difficulty in determining who the writer was. Some suppose it was composed by Job himself, some by Elihu, and others think it may have been written by Moses.

A great deal of pains has been taken by some critics to prove that the book is only an allegory, and not a real history. But there seems no room for reasonable doubt that Job was a real person, and that the book is a real history, the "higher" and all other criticism notwithstanding.

That Job was a real person and not a mere name such as allegorists or novelists use is apparent from the references made to him by Ezekiel xiv. 14, 20, and by St. James v. 11. Ezekiel mentions Job in conjunction with Noah and Daniel, who were real persons, and eminent servants of God. And it would seem contrary to all usage and custom amongst writers, sacred or secular, to name two real persons and one myth in such a way as Ezekiel does.

The Apostle James refers to him as an example of patience: "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy" (James v. 11). It would be a very unnatural and strained interpretation of the language of the tenth and eleventh verses of this chapter to infer that the Apostle only meant a myth, and not a real person.

It is hardly possible at this distance of time to decide in what language it was first composed. Some are disposed to infer, from the style of the book, that it may have been written first in Arabic, and rendered into Hebrew by a later hand.

The first two chapters which form the introduction are written in prose, and the rest in poetry, and to much of the language of this book we may apply what has been said by a distinguished writer and scholar of Hebrew poetry generally: "In lyric flow and fire, in crushing force and majesty, the poetry of the ancient Scriptures is the most superb that ever burned within the breast of man" (Sir D. K. Sandford).

Having explained so much as to the book itself, I now proceed to the consideration of the subject I wish to bring before you to-day, viz.:

The Ministry of Angels.—"And there came a messenger unto Job." The Greek word αγγελος here translated messenger is the word generally used to denote angels, though it is also used to signify prophets, priests, winds, plagues, etc. It is also applied to the Second Person of the Trinity, or Angel of His Presence, the Angel of the Covenant, that is, the Lord Jesus Christ. But, as I have said, it is the word usually employed to designate those heavenly intelligences called angels, and the English word angel is only a modified form of the Greek word αγγελος, "angel" or "messenger."

The holy angels are also called "thrones," dominions, principalities, powers," "sons of God," "mighty angels," "elect angels," "ministering spirits." The names Cherubim and Seraphim are also given to some orders of the heavenly hierarchy. The word cherub is derived from the Hebrew verb כָּרַב (the first part of which is not used), which means to hold, to seize, to lay hold of.

The cherubim in the Tabernacle or Temple were symbolical or ideal creatures of fourfold nature representing a man, an ox, an eagle, and a lion, but the predominant appearance was that of a man. They symbolised power and strength, swiftness and intelligence, the most exalted parts of creature life.

The cherubims in the Tabernacle extended their wings over the lid of the ark called the mercy-seat. Hence God, who appeared there as a God of mercy, pardoning the sins of the people and accepting their sacrifices, is said to "dwell between the cherubims."

The figures of cherubims thus made and placed were emblematic representations of the angels. They are represented with their faces towards the mercy-seat, as if contemplating the mysteries of redeeming love foreshadowed thus in and through the Ark.

The word Seraph means dazzling, bright, or burning. Seraphims are mentioned in a well-known passage in Isaiah vi. 2-6. In the second verse we read, "Above it (*i. e.*, the throne) stood the seraphims: each one had *six* wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly."

This awful vision of God, and the Seraphim veiling their faces before the majesty of the whole earth, filled the prophet with a humiliating sense of his own great sinfulness and vileness.

If these holy and sinless beings thus humble themselves in the presence of that great God who sits on the throne of the Universe, "high and lifted up," and think so little of their exalted services; well may the prophet feel alarmed at his own boldness in taking upon him, as Abraham did, to speak to the Lord and in His name, with unhallowed lips.

The fact that these pure, exalted, and sinless beings, cherubim and seraphim, thus—

> "Veil their faces while they cry,
> Thrice holy to their God most high,
> Thrice holy to their King,"

may serve to show us, poor sin-stained mortals what we are, with what humility and reverence we should approach His mercy-seat.

Though Isaiah, after this revelation of the Divine glory felt himself unworthy of the prophetic office, God encouraged him by the symbolical action of a seraph as mentioned in the sixth verse, "Then flew one of the seraphim unto me having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar, and he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips, and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged."

This sacred fire from the altar represents the sacrifice of Christ and His merits; He "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself"; God "laid on Him the iniquity of us all." And on account of His "all-sufficient merit" all sin is forgiven to those who "truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy gospel." The heart is filled with Divine love, which thus constrains to every Christian duty. When men are thus qualified for God's service by the application to their hearts and consciences of the atoning work of the Lord Jesus, neither a feeling of their own unworthiness, nor a dread of the dangers and difficulties they may have to encounter, will deter them from attempting great things for God and expecting great things from God.

The Numbers of the Angels.—As to the numbers of these angelic beings nothing definite is said in Holy Scripture, but from various expressions used, such as "a multitude of the heavenly host," "twelve legions of angels," "an innumerable company of angels," "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands," we may infer that they are almost innumerable.

That there are different ranks and orders of angels is also clear from several passages of Holy Scripture. Thus we read of Gabriel, who "stands in the presence of God" (Luke i. 19), of Michael the Archangel, "one of the chief Princes," and "the Great Prince" (Dan. xii. 1 and x. 13). We also read of "thrones and dominions, principalities and powers," terms which are evidently used to designate different ranks and orders of the hierarchy of heaven. But the sacred writers do not gratify our curiosity by stating the number of different ranks amongst angelic beings. Some of the Jewish Rabbis reckon *four*, and others *ten* orders. This precision, however, is merely the result of imagination, as nothing has been revealed as to the precise number, and conjecture is useless and unnecessary.

When St. Paul, in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews, is labouring for words and comparisons to show the dignity and exaltation of the Lord Jesus, and His superiority to all created beings, he makes this reference to the angels: "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation." Hence we see the dignity and importance of man, especially when he is made "a new creature in Christ Jesus." Angels are his servants. They take a deep interest in all that relates to his redemption and salvation, and "There is joy in heaven among the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." They praised God over the plains of Bethlehem when it was announced that a Saviour should be born. They announced His birth to the shepherds, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, for unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." They ministered to that Saviour in His temptation. They strengthened Him in the garden of Gethsemane. They were present at the sepulchre, at and after His resurrection, and conversed with the women who had come on the tender and pious mission of embalming His body. An angel delivered Peter from prison. And when the wondering disciples looked upon the Saviour's ascent to heaven, two angels appeared to them, and announced His return, saying, "This same Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go to heaven."

An angel comforted Daniel, when his mind was troubled and perplexed, as to the meaning of the visions which he saw (xii.). Another delivered God's people from imminent peril by destroying 185,000 of the Assyrian army. Thus they are truly ministering spirits to God's people. Even the highest and most exalted angels are employed in watching over and protecting "the heirs of salvation."

Thus, as man was at first tempted and led into sin by a fallen angel, and as the power of evil angels is still exerted for his ruin, there is something fitting, and beautifully appropriate, in the fact, that holy angels should be his ministering servants, helpers, and guardians. And not only do they thus watch over and protect God's people, "encamping round about them that fear Him" during life, but they also watch their dying hours, attend their departing spirits when severed from the body, and conduct them to the paradise of God. So we are told that Lazarus was carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom. There is no impropriety in believing that holy angels thus watch and wait around God's children, "When the spark of life is waning," and "Tend their pathway home." And surely never does the soul of man more need a heavenly guide than when it has just quit the shores of time and launched upon the shoreless ocean of eternity. This view of the angels' ministry is beautifully described by E. H. Bickersteth (Bishop of Exeter), in his magnificent epic poem, "Yesterday, To-day, and for Ever," a book that deserves to be better known than it is, as, in my opinion, it

is the only sacred epic fit to be classed with, or named in the same breath as "Paradise Lost." In words of exquisite beauty, simplicity, and tenderness the poet describes the death of the "Seer," and the passage of his disembodied spirit to the world of spirits, conducted by Oriel, his guardian angel. There is first the warning of approaching dissolution, "Seven days and thou shalt enter into rest." Then the answer of cheerful resignation and readiness to obey the summons, "Thou callest me, O Lord, and here am I." The last family prayer together, accompanied by the reading of some "fragments from the Book of Life," which contains words—God's words—that are "tender in their strength, and in their very tenderness are strong. Then we have depicted the gradual descent into the river (of death), the spirits final release from the body, and entrance into the great unknown eternity. The exclamation of surprise and wonder, "Where am I?" and a gentle voice, more musically soft than those the wind elicits from æolian harp or lute, made answer, "Brother, thou art by my side, by me, thy guardian angel, who have watched thy footsteps from the wicket gate of life, and now am here to tend thy pathway home."

Then we have related the journey through the vast abyss of space, "swifter than the winds of heaven." The passage to and fro of angels, "swift as lightning." "In groups of light" they move, some bearing in their hands the weary pilgrims to their home of rest, and others carrying to the prison-house of woe the disembodied souls of men "who lived and died in sin."

Thus on they glide, and now at last "the air grew tremulous with heavenly melody," as of the voice of harpers harping with their harps." And, lo! there soon appeared a company of angels "clothed in light" thronging the path, or "in the amber air suspense." "And in the twinkling of an eye we were among them, and they clustered round and waved their wings, and struck their harps again for gladness. Every look was tenderness, and every word was musical with joy." And then they all break forth in glad acclaim—

> "Welcome to heaven, dear brother, welcome home,
> Welcome to thy inheritance of light,
> Welcome for ever to thy Master's joy."

Thus I consider we are warranted in believing the attendant angels conduct the spirits of those who die in the Lord to their heavenly home above.

Creation of the Angels.—At what time in the infinity of ages past these angelic beings were created the sacred volume does not tell us, because it does not concern us to know. It is one of those secret things that "belong to the Lord."

In this book of Job they are spoken of as the "Sons of God" (i. 6; ii. 1; xxxviii. 7), and are represented as rejoicing at the creation of the world. But at whatever time in the boundless past they were created, as God said, "Let there be light, and there was light," so He said in that earlier time: "Let spirits exist, and they existed."

"Of these were three the foremost: Lucifer, Michael, and Gabriel." Some retained their loyalty and obedience to the Great Monarch of all, and have been for ever confirmed in their first estate of purity and happiness. Others, lifted up by pride, and aiming after equality with God Himself, rebelled against the Majesty of heaven. So we are told "there was war in heaven," "and in their fiendish pride," they schemed to wrest the sceptre from Almighty power, and baffle the All-wise in counsel. Fools, and blind. These angels which kept not their first estate, nor maintained their loyalty to the eternal King, are represented as "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness until the judgment of the great day." Lucifer, the leader of these fallen angels, had been constituted "God's great vicegerent over all the earth," and having fallen and dragged down others with him, tried to mar and destroy and subvert God's work, and God's authority and power, in revenge for his expulsion from the courts of heaven. This leader of evil is now called by various names, such as the Devil, Satan, Apollyon, Beelzebub, "Prince of Darkness," "God of this world," etc. Throughout the Holy Scriptures he is always spoken of as a personal agent and not a mere principle of evil.

He tries to injure the souls of men now, by persuasion and suggestion, and deception, as he did our first parents, and he will finally be condemned to the lake of fire "prepared for the devil and his angels," where "the intolerable pangs of conscience, seeking rest and finding none, will prove a terror that hath torment."

"And there came a messenger unto Job." Yes, there came several messengers, one after the other, and each bore sadder tidings than his predecessor. Poor Job's troubles thickened and increased rapidly, and his cup of sorrow was soon filled to overflowing. The message I bring you to-day is not a saddening, but a gladdening one. It is "good news from a far country." It is good news from heaven. Good news for all, that "Jesus is mighty to save, and all His salvation may know."

> "All glory to Jesus be given,
> That life and salvation are free;
> And all may be washed and forgiven,
> And Jesus can save even me."

God sends many messengers to men. Sometimes, as in the case of Job, their message is a severe one.

He sends plagues, pestilences, famines, pain, suffering and death. He speaks to them by the events of His providence, the preaching of His gospel, and the strivings of His spirit. Aye, it may be that some of those pure and holy beings who minister to God's people are hovering around us to-day, waiting to carry the tidings heavenward, that the "dead are alive, and the lost are found." Shall they wait in vain? Must they carry the news

to the heavenly city that you are still undecided? Halting between two opinions? Neither cold nor hot? Could we press them to delay their flight, we would urge them to remain a moment longer. It may be even yet that some poor soul will decide, like Joshua, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." I have long withstood His grace, I can hold out no longer.

> "Take my poor heart and let it be
> For ever closed to all but Thee;
> Seal Thou my breast, and let me wear
> The pledge of love for ever there."

And so there will be "joy in heaven among the angels" for an heir of glory born.

DANGER OF FORSAKING DUTY'S PATH.

By the Rev. E. F. CHAPMAN, M.A., Vicar of Belmont, Durham.

Sermon Preached in Belmont Church on Sunday, August 9th, 1891.

"And he came thither unto a cave, and lodged there; and, behold, the word of the Lord came to him, and said unto him, 'What doest thou here, Elijah?'"—1 Kings xix. 9.

THE Bible furnishes the record of many strange things; the reader is again and again being startled by statements of most remarkable and unlooked-for character some truth, which he cannot explain, some fact which to him seems an impossibility. Each page reveals to him the unexpected, tells him of things quite beyond his comprehension. As he reads, he wonders; surprising incidents meet his view; remarkable events continally confront him. In the history of nations, and of men, matters are seen to take an unexpected turn, yet in every page and in every line of those histories we may see, if we only look for it, the hand of God. Let us not doubt, let us not say and think to ourselves, "Such and such a thing could not possibly have happened, or such and such a thing should have had a much different result, or because I cannot understand this or that I will not believe it." Surely that is no fitting way in which to read those sacred writings, any such method must produce but a poor result indeed; but, reading with faith, with humility, with reverence, we shall make true progress in Divine things. In the history of Elijah, for instance, there are many points which set us thinking and wondering; many things which are a great surprise to us, yet every word of it is true, each incident in that changeful history has been written for our learning. There is not a single event in his life, however improbable it may appear, which did not really and truly take place; and in that history, as in all others, we may see God's hand. Let us, then, this evening glance at Elijah's history, paying more special attention to that portion of it which was read as our first lesson this evening. It is in the 17th chapter of the first book of Kings that we get the first glimpse of Elijah. In that chapter we see him appearing before Ahab, to whom he brings a startling message, "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word." That was all he said; it was but a brief communication that he made, and yet we can well understand how that short and simple message should cause Ahab considerable uneasiness. Here was a man hitherto unknown, and having about him nothing by way of commendation, without authority apparently, yet delivering to him a message of such strange and serious import. "No dew, no rain," except in accordance with his word, such a message for Elijah, the Tishbite, to take to the proud king of Israel! The message delivered, the messenger betakes himself, according to Divine instructions, to the brook Cherith beyond Jordan, and is there miraculously supported. And, later on, the brook having dried up, he is found in the house of a poor widow whom God had appointed to sustain him. Then in the third year there comes to him a further intimation from God telling him to "Go and show himself unto Ahab" (1 Kings xviii. 1), and on his way he discovers how widespread was the famine which prevailed in Samaria; he meets Obadiah, the governor of Ahab's house, who had been sent out in search of water, so that, at any rate, some of their cattle might be saved. Then, a little later, we have the memorable interview between Ahab and Elijah; we see these two men, so entirely different from each other, so utterly unlike in every particular, standing face to face. The king is the first to speak, and his words show only too clearly that his mind is ill at ease: "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" "Art thou the cause of all this trouble which prevails in my dominions?" Elijah denies at once the imputation, and retorts upon the royal idolater. Ahab was hardly prepared for those bold and faithful words of the man of God: "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim" (1 Kings xviii. 18). The outcome of that interview was a challenge on the part of Elijah: he suggests that the dispute in question should be settled on Mount Carmel. And, as we turn our gaze in the direction of that Mount, we see one of the most remarkable events recorded in God's Book of Truth. There, on that Mount, it would be shown that the God whom Elijah served was the true God, and that Baal was a mere idol of man's creating, utterly powerless to help. There, on that Mount, we see on the one side the worshippers of Baal, 450 priests, 400 prophets of the groves, 850 men; and on the other side we see one man, seemingly without a friend—nay, an object of hatred to all around him. Elijah is that man, and as he stands

there his defeat would, no doubt, be settled by anticipation in the minds of the bystanders; "the day is ours" would, doubtless, be the secret thought of his opponents. Yet it was not so. Those men lose their battle, the defeat is theirs, and Elijah stands before them a victor; and there is heard, going up from the thousands of on-lookers, one loud, unanimous cry, "The Lord, He is the God; the Lord, He is the God" (1 Kings xviii. 39). And this brings us to a sad and painful contrast in the life history of this man. Strange revelations now confront us, we now meet with the unexpected. Jezebel, Ahab's wife, enraged at what had taken place, sends a threatening message to Elijah; that message ran thus: "So let the gods do to me, and more also, if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by to-morrow about this time" (1 Kings xix. 2). And Elijah, as soon as he hears those threatening words, escapes for his life to Beersheba, finding his way eventually into a wilderness. What a change in the history of Elijah! What a remarkable turn of affairs! To think that Elijah who had recently stood forward as the champion for the truth, who had boldly confronted the proud monarch, Ahab, and fearlessly told him of his own sins, and who, later on, had stood on Mount Carmel faltering not, but erect and firm as the truth itself, whose earnest and solemn voice had been listened to with intense awe: "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him" (1 Kings xviii. 21). To think that this man, formerly so brave and true, should be seen now hastening from duty's path into a desert! The excitement of Carmel has died away, the shout which so lately rent the air is no longer heard, and all is still. And turning our gaze away from Mount Carmel, we look towards Beersheba, and in a wilderness in that locality we see a man resting under a juniper-tree, and as we look at him, we hear strange, remarkable words coming from his lips, "It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life; for I am not better than my fathers" (1 Kings xix. 4). That man is Elijah! Those words, which, coming from *any* lips, would have been sinful, *are his!* He who had but yesterday defied the worshippers of Baal; and who had been the upholder of truth, the light shining in a dark place, now flies from his post, and throwing himself under a juniper-tree, "requests that he might die." Strange contradiction! Here is a man flying from death on the one hand, yet seeking it on the other. His request is not complied with, for his life-work is not yet finished; there is more for him to do. As he sleeps there, under that tree, an Angel of the Lord comes to him twice; a meal is provided for him, and in the strength of the nourishment then received, he journeys forty days and nights. He proceeds to Mount Horeb; he lodges in a cave, and to him, in that cave, there comes, once and yet a second time, a voice—it was the voice of God. "What doest thou here, Elijah?" What hast *thou* of all men to do here? Thou, My chosen servant, who hast a special work to do for Me, to whom has been assigned a special place, the upholding of My cause, the fighting of My battles, "What doest thou, My prophet, in this selfish, dismal solitude? What doest thou here Elijah?" Let us now leave the prophet, and let us consider this question which was put to him, under such solemn circumstance *in its bearing upon ourselves*, for not only in that cave on Mount Horeb, not only in those early days of Bible history, but in our own hearts, in these times of great advancement, and of many privileges, may be heard that questioning, that reproving voice, the voice of Him who made us, and gave us the possibilities of much usefulness: "What doest thou here?" Does not this question come to us in many an hour and day of our life? And is it not one which concerns us very closely? That still small voice, the voice of God in the soul, yes, we must have heard it many, many times; accusing us of being where we should not have been; of neglecting great and pressing duties; of overlooking our truest interests. And, though that voice be a reproving one, though it calls to our minds things we would feign forget, yet it is a mercy for us when it reaches our hearts, and brings us in deep contrition to our knees, and leads us back again to the way of duty. It is a message of love, though the tones of it are harsh, "What doest thou here?" In the case of Elijah, we observe that, formerly very strong, he now becomes lamentably weak; he passes from one extreme to the other; on Mount Carmel he is seen full of holy boldness for God's cause, standing up bravely to do battle for the God of Israel, striking a terrible blow against idolatry; but, in that cave near Mount Horeb, he is as one lamentably weak. His faith fails him, his courage has fled, he is a deserter from the cause he once so bravely defended. And do we not find how, in the Church, as we join in the prayers, as we listen to the read and preached word, or as we assemble round the Holy Table, do we not find ourselves strong for God's service, able we think to undertake great things for Him who has loved us; and, as we have gone forth and mingled with the world, the world of business, the world of pleasure, the world of wealth or of poverty, as we engage in our daily work, how weak we become, how soon we have forgotten, how easily and how quickly have all those good impressions been wiped away! Like Elijah of old, and like Simon Peter of later times, we are found to be weak in that very part where we, perhaps, considered ourselves the strongest. We shall do well to examine ourselves in this particular, and as we think of the fugitive prophet, to remember that in our own day, as in his, it is impossible to escape the eye of God. Be where we may, go where we will, we shall still be

under the notice of the Almighty. And when we are in places where we should not be, we shall most assuredly hear His questioning, His reproving voice, "What doest thou here?" It is well when we pay heed to such a question and turn it to our own spiritual profit, for we know that a day is fast approaching when the account of our lives will have to be rendered, when the question will be not "what doest thou in this particular place, or at this particular time," but "what hast thou been doing *all thy life?*" What hast thou done with thy gifts and thy talents, with thy time and thy money, with thy week-days and thy Sabbaths? How hast thou treated the messages, the pleadings, the promises, the mercies, the warnings which have been sent thee time after time? Would that we might see these matters in their true light. We remember when our Lord told His disciples of His own coming sufferings, and announced to them that one of their number should betray Him, there were great heart-searchings; and from one and another, and another, there came the anxious question, "Lord, is it I?" So we, as we meditate upon the weakness of this hitherto strong man, as we contemplate Elijah out of duty's path, should be very anxious lest we too should be wandering away into places where we not only can do no good, but where we may receive harm. This portion of Elijah's history seems to tell us that we should go to no place where we feel that the blessing of God cannot accompany us.

"What doest thou here?" What answer shall he return who, away from God's house, away from Divine influences, sits in the company of swearers or profane talkers. And what shall he say, in reply, who is going away daily from duty and from God? Would that we, each of us, might be found at our posts, doing our duty in that position in which God has placed us; "doing, with our might, the things which He would have us to do, that at last we might hear the Master's own welcome, "Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

THE Rev. Bartholomew Price, M.A., Vice-Gerent of Pembroke, Sedleian Professor of Natural Philosophy, Honorary Fellow of Queen's, and Fellow of Winchester, has been nominated by Lord Salisbury Chancellor of the University, Master of Pembroke College, Oxford, in succession to the late Dr. Evans. The nomination fell to the Chancellor, in accordance with the statutes of the college, upon the failure of the Fellows to agree in the election of a head. Professor Price took his degree in 1840, obtaining a Third Class in Classics and a First in Mathematics. He was University mathematic scholar in 1842, and has been professor of natural philosophy since 1853. Since 1847 onwards he has been repeatedly mathematical examiner and moderator, and for many years was the principal mathematical tutor in Oxford.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 23, 1892.

THE CARDINAL.

CARDINAL MANNING has followed Cardinal Newman to the grave. It is nearly half a century since the lapse of the brilliant Archdeacon of Chichester dealt to the Church of England a blow under which she seemed to stagger. Those were dark times; the Church was wounded in the house of her friends; her dearest children turned against her; her trustiest champions proved false. There seemed good reason for fearing the worst, as the wave of defection rolled higher and higher, and pure souls and brilliant intellects fell away, not one by one, but almost in troops. Many of them even became enemies, and the shrewdest blows and the unkindest stabs were dealt by the great controversialist who has now gone to understand the end of all these things, and to measure the full extent of the insignificance of earthly disputes and wrangles.

He is gone—his companions have all gone before him—only a few old men still bear about a blunted recollection of those stirring days. We, in our generation, can hardly realise the epoch of our fathers, when even the wisest dreaded the immediate reconquest of England by Rome, and the fear spread from rulers to people and back to rulers again, and found expression in popular commotions and short-lived Acts of Parliament. Living in a calmer atmosphere, with the light of greater experience, we look back with wonder at those times. But the sad event of the past week quickens recollection and enlivens thought. How futile were the apprehensions of our fathers! The dead cardinal, whatever may have been his private hopes and opinions, lived to see all idea of the reconquest of England fade out of the minds of men.

He lived to see men's fears belied, their prophecies proved false, their apprehensions groundless; his own strokes, terrible as they appeared when he dealt them, he came to learn were discharged upon the air; the Church which seemed to totter at his defection remains at his death unshaken still. So it must ever be—national in its origin, Catholic in its bearings; the Church never yet depended, and never will depend, upon the separate or united action of individual members, however exalted their position or grand their gifts. The Romanists were jubilant in those days, the Anglicans were downcast; hopes and fears were alike vain; the issue was hidden from the wise and prudent, while the work of God was wrought among those who were of simple trust and faith. What were the Cardinal's reflections in his latter days? Did he not sometimes watch the progress of the Church he had deserted with interest, possibly with regret?

The thought arises: After all, was not that trial of the Church a blessing in disguise? Was not the loss of the great group who fell away with Newman and with Manning no loss really, but gain? The answer must be, Yes. Seeing in what direction their feelings and convictions tended, there could have been nothing but risk in their continued leadership, and since they could only have led into troubles and dangers, it was better that they should cease to be trusted in that capacity and should stand, in matters of doctrine, as open foes. What fetters might have been riveted on the church if Newman and Manning and their fellows had remained to darken her counsels?

These thoughts stand as part of the lesson of the long life which has now closed. After all, things are ordered for the best. To our fathers such careers as that of Cardinal Manning brought trouble and dismay and sore trial of faith; to us they bring strength of conviction and confidence; our fathers saw only the loss, it is ours to see the gain, to rejoice over a Church which is strong enough to abide all trials, to rise triumphant out of dangers, to prove itself independent alike of human strength or weakness. The winds and storms of doubt may rage, and the waters of defection may rise around her, but the Church stands firm, for her foundation is upon a rock. It remains for men like Cardinal Manning to allow the subtleties of scholastic disputations to stand before Divine truth, and in straining at the Privy Council to swallow the infallibility of the Pope; they come and go and their works follow them, but the Church stands firm. The storms of criticism may beat over her, and the waves of defection rise around her, but they rage and swell to no purpose, for her foundation is upon a rock.

THE *Chester Diocesan Gazette* appears this month in a new and greatly improved form. It is printed on toned paper of a much better quality than formerly, and on the cover is a representation of the cathedral.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"IS THERE A PURGATORY?"

SIR,—There is nothing to the point in "Vicar's" letter of the 9th inst. about a Purgatory. He says "there may be a place of safety for all." I say not "may be," but that there is surely a place of safety for all in Christ *now;* and that heaven is the place where all who die in Christ go to; and the fact that there are three heavens only shows that there are degrees in glory, just as there are degrees in holiness here. But this says nothing about the possibility of people getting out of hell who ever have had the sad misfortune to go there.

Further, he says, "when the term (of their punishment) is accomplished," etc., but whether it shall ever terminate is the point in dispute. He remarks, "God is love," this is quite true, but He is also "a consuming fire." He adds again, "how fearful to think even of a measure of punishment—say one hundred years in hell." This is quite true also; and because it is a fearful thing I would like to save everybody, if possible, from going there at all. The man who goes to hell on the strength of a "may be" of ever getting out of it again, when he has it in his power now to avoid going there at all, does himself an endless injury.

Christ can do now for all men what they require to fit them for heaven; why do they not now come for this purpose to Him?

It appears that I have become an enemy to "J. B." because I have told him the truth; and that I am "rude" because I have exposed the fallacy of his reasoning. I am afraid that that term is a misnomer as applied to me in the present case, because there is nothing rude in the sentences which he gives as offensive from my letters.

However, as he considers them rude, I will, in deference to his tender sensitivity, withdraw them; but, at the same time, I cannot help thinking that this retort of "rudeness" is only a garment of flimsy gauze, made to cover the nakedness of his logical deformity, but do what he will he cannot hide that deformity, because it shows itself ever and anon. Take, for instance, the following sentence from his last letter. "It seems clear to me that the English words 'eternal' and 'everlasting' have been, and still are, generally understood by Englishmen to mean endless." He does not seem to see how he furnishes me with an argument in this statement, because I can reply that if it be true that Englishmen have and do still generally take "endless" as the meaning of the words "eternal" and "everlasting," then those Englishmen who translated the English Bible from the original Scriptures must have regarded "endless" as the meaning of the word αἰώνιος in Matt. xxv. 46, because they have translated it by "eternal" and "everlasting." And then he goes on to say, "but the original words which are rendered 'eternal' and 'everlasting' in our Authorised and Revised Version of the Bible do not mean 'endless.'" Which statement amounts to saying that he puts himself on one side, and the English translators on the other, and says to all the intelligent readers of your valuable paper, Choose you this day whose authority you will

follow; that of those godly and learned men, or of me, 'J. B."!

Mr. Murphy said, in the PULPIT of December 19th, that "it is obvious that if 'eternal times' means times that have ended, 'eternal punishment' does not necessarily mean 'endless punishment.'" He thus joins together as antecedent and consequent two things which have no such relationship to each other. Before he can thus join them together in a hypothetical proposition, he must show that they have an *inseparable* connection the one with the other, either as cause and effect, or in some other way. But this he cannot do; and to show the invalidity of his reasoning, I inserted "eternal God" instead of "eternal punishment," which I had a perfect right to do, for anything he had said to the contrary. From this he admits there followed an absurdity, which is a tacit admission that there was a fallacy in the reasoning. And where was that fallacy but in the unnatural and violent conjunction of the terms in his hypothetical premiss? In reply, my remarks in the PULPIT of the 2nd inst. were directed to point out this fallacy, and not to "determine the meaning of a word." What I asked Mr. Murphy to do was to make a "*consistent*" interpretation of "eternal times" and "eternal God." This he has not done, but replies by saying that Dr. Donaldson's argument does not touch the question of what St. Paul actually meant to say, but only of what Dr. Donaldson thinks it likely that he meant." I can say the same to Mr. Murphy, that *his* argument bears only on what Mr. Murphy "*thinks*" St. Paul meant. But what a ridiculous thing for Mr. Murphy to say! What can any of us say more than what we "*think*" the inspired writers meant? And what gave rise to the present controversy but the fact that Mr. Murphy and I "*think*" opposite things to be the meaning of Matt. xxv. 46? But he might have saved himself the trouble of expressing himself thus; because I meant to express no opinion whatever at that time as to what the Apostle meant. We shall try and find out its meaning now. He says, "eternal times" are times that have ended. We admit this: but may we ask when those times *began?* What is the meaning of "eternal" in that phrase? The Apostle means to say it had *always* been kept secret; it had *never* been revealed before; it had been kept secret in *all* past ages, that is, from eternity; kept secret in that part of duration which has *no beginning*. "Eternal times," then, are times which have no beginning. Bengel renders it: *tempora primo sui initio æternitatem quasi præviam attingentia;* times *touching* on, as it were, to a previous eternity. Meyer and Olshausen have "in eternity;" Barnes, "it has *always* been concealed."

According to this interpretation, "eternal punishment" will signify a period which has a beginning, but *no end;* a punishment lasting through an endless αἰὼν. The word αἰὼν is used in Psalm xc. 2, to signify that part of duration which *preceded* creation, as well as that part which shall *succeed* it. (Sept.) "*Before* the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, *even* from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God." This gives the word "eternal" a *consistent* meaning in "eternal times," "eternal punishment," and "eternal God."

In his letter to the PULPIT of 19th December, Mr. Murphy laid down the dictum that "when a word (αἰὼν) primarily and commonly means a limited, though very long time, there is a presumption that its immediate derivative (αἰώνιος) will not always, nor necessarily denote absolutely endless time." He need not have written the latter part of this sentence, because no one denies that it does not always signify endless time. But whether it does or does not in the present case, is the point in dispute. But let us interpret the phrase "eternal life" by this dictum; then we are obliged to say that there is a "*presumption* that 'eternal' does not here mean absolutely endless time." But, in his letter of January 9th, he says it means "*strictly* everlasting." Here is a flat contradiction which he cannot get rid of except by giving up either his dictum or the "strictly everlasting life." Of course he would say that in "eternal punishment," there was this "presumption," but then *why* does he keep to his dictum in the one case, and depart from it in the other? *Why* does he hop about from the one meaning to the other in this jejune fashion? His conduct is quite arbitrary.

Further, he says that "eternal," in eternal punishment, and in "eternal life," means the *same*, that "it means agelong in both places;" but then he adds that the "age of punishment is *temporary*, that of life strictly everlasting." How can it mean the *same*, if the age in one case is limited and in the other unlimited? This is a piece of contradictory trifling which I would not expect Mr. Murphy to be guilty of on such an awful subject.

The real state of the case is this: here is the Saviour of Men speaking on the most momentous subject that can occupy human minds, to the same people, at the same time, and in the same breath using, in two successive sentences, the same word, which any unsophisticated and unprejudiced mind would take to mean the same thing, and especially since He did not tell them it meant differently.

Now the question which I wish Mr. Murphy to answer is, how does he know that the Saviour meant differently, that the people to whom He spoke understood Him to mean differently, and that *we* are obliged to understand him differently in each of the two phrases? When he says that "αἰὼν primarily means a limited though very long time" he speaks without authority. If the primary meaning be a limited time, no one can in *propriety*, by any stretch of imagination, make it signify an unlimited time; but if the primary sense be unlimited, then we can, by an accommodation of circumstances, understand it to mean a limited, though very long, period. In the Septuagint of Gen. xxi. 33, we have θεὸς αἰώνιος as the translation of *Yehovah el olam.* Now here its proper and literal meaning is that of absolutely endless time. There is no "*presumption*" here, no figure of speech, and no accommodating of circumstances. All is literal, and all is real. Now it could not be so used unless its primary sense was that of endless duration. When we speak of the "everlasting hills," we know that the "hills" are not strictly everlasting, but that the word is used in a hyperbolic way, to point out their great age. And no one is in danger of mistaking the meaning. But when we read of "everlasting punishment," as coming after the judgment of the last day, there are no accommodating circumstances in the one case more than in the other, to limit the unlimited meaning of the word. There is no ground for any "*presumption.*"

I had always thought that the meaning and derivation of αἰὼν was settled by Aristotle, who in his *De Cœlo*, lib. i. cap. 9, tells us that it is compounded of ἀεὶ, always, and ὤν, being: αἰῶν ἐστίν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ οὖσαν and the eminent lexicographers, Liddell and Scott, in

their Greek-English Lexicon, refer us to the same authority for this meaning of the word. Mr. Murphy has now an opportunity of discussing the matter with them, with the view of rectifying their mistake! The 30th Psalm, which he quotes at the end of his letter, refers, not to the life after death, but to the present one. The Service for the "Visitation of Prisoners" in the Prayer-Book, shows quite clearly what the teaching of the Church of England is on this point, and so do the Homilies.

R. DONALDSON.

January 13th, 1892.

PRESBYTERIAN ORDERS.

SIR,—I observe that Canon Crosthwaite persists in objecting to my statement of a fact known to every one acquainted with our Church history, viz., that before Charles the Second's Act of Uniformity, ministers of Presbyterian orders were competent by law to hold cures of souls and preferments. He, in to-day's PULPIT, makes a kind of further denial of the above unquestionable fact by quoting the case of Travers, who, he says was rejected by the Puritanically disposed Archbishop Whitgift. It is true that the Archbishop made interest with the Queen and the Privy Council, who had the appointment, to prevent Travers from obtaining the Temple preachership; and it is true that he sneered at Travers' ordination, as "by the Presbytery of Antwerp, if ever he were ordained at all." But it is not true that the archbishop ever, by legal process, or otherwise, ejected, or got ejected, Travers, or any other Presbyterially ordained minister, from any benefice; and it is not true that Whitgift or any one else could have got such a minister ejected on the ground of his orders. Nor is it true, that I ever heard, that Whitgift was Puritanically disposed.

I hope I shall be put to no more trouble in replying to these persistent contradictions of known fact, and of the contents of Acts of Parliament.

January 16th. EDMUND LAWRENCE.

REVIEW OF DR. INCE'S SERMON.

SIR,—I observe that Dr. Ince's sermon, which has recently attracted a considerable amount of interest, is reviewed in your number of the 16th inst. The review is not favourable, rather fault-finding; the writer complaining of a want of what he thinks should have been in the sermon. Now a sermon should be limited in length, and cannot contain everything. The purpose of Dr. Ince evidently is to protest against those views of the Holy Eucharist which appear to be at present on the advance, the Romish views or like them. It may be generally the best way to expose error, to declare the truth and nothing more; but sometimes more is expedient. To depreciate this able sermon because it is mainly negative, as your reviewer calls it, is mere fault-finding. If the writer said no more, the matter might be passed over; but his zeal for fault-finding runs away with him. "The Catechism says that before it (the Divine Presence in the Eucharist) reaches the heart it is with the bread; and St. Paul says that it is communicated or divided to us, before it is in our hearts." Suppose your reviewer should say, that it is inferable from St. Paul, and from the Catechism, as above; one might dispute this without flatly contradicting; but when he says things that are against fact, viz.: that St. Paul and the Catechism say what they do not say, he must not expect any one with a head and brains in it to follow him. Observe, besides, his caution (or is it uncandour), in his use of prepositions. He makes the Presence to be "with" the bread, and "in" our hearts. Does he mean that it is *in* both? Or what does he mean? Again, he says he prefers the translation *communicating* in 1 Cor. x. 16. I should like to know does he prefer it because it is the truest translation, or because he sees the possibility of insinuating a particular doctrine by tampering with the meaning of the Greek. But possibly he is innocent of Greek. It is difficult not to perceive, on referring to κοινός and its derivatives, and to the use of them in 1 Cor. x. 16-20, that the idea of sharing, and not of being shared or communicated to, is contained. With regard to authorities, your reviewer disdains Hooker. Does he also disdain Cosin, Jeremy Taylor, and multitudes more of sound divines? Sacrificing the Catechism and St. Paul at the shrine of Hooker! What in the name of the Queen's English is Hooker's shrine?

January 18, 1892. B.

IRISH CHURCH PRAYER-BOOK.

SIR,—Canon Crosthwaite has a letter in the PULPIT of this day in which he returns to the subject of the revision of the Irish Prayer-Book. I do not admit that his account is an account of facts at all, but only a comment on the facts, written from his point of view; and I have been a member of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland ever since disestablishment.

It is, I am thankful to say, true that the Athanasian Creed is no longer read in the service of the Church of Ireland. It is also true, though your readers will not find it in the Canon's letter, that the Baptismal Service remains unchanged, except that in the opening exhortation, the words of our Lord, from John iii. are quoted exactly from the Authorised Version, and that a rubric has been added, disavowing superstition in the use of the sign of the cross. There is also the following new rubric: "Parents may be sponsors for their own children. When three sponsors cannot be found, two shall suffice; and if two cannot be found, one shall suffice."

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, January 16th, 1892.

LORD SALISBURY'S appointment of Professor Price to be the Master of Pembroke College, Oxford, will be recognised by the University generally as both generous and just. None of his competitors could rival Professor Price in academical and scientific attainment, while the distinguished services he has rendered in many public capacities to the University seemed to mark him out as one pre-eminently fit to be rewarded with this mark of honour.

THE first meeting of captains of the Church Lads' Brigade for the diocese of London was held last Tuesday week at the offices of the Welfare Council, Northumberland-chambers, Prebendary Whittington, chairman of the brigade committee, presiding.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS

Adams, Rev. Charles E., M.A.; Vicar of Bisney, Oxford.
Anderson, Rev. Irvine Kempt; Rector of St. Mary Tavy, Devonshire.
Anstiss, Rev. G. W., Vicar of Ivybridge; Chaplain of the Plymouth Borough Asylum, at Blackadon, Ivybridge.
Baker, Rev. H. F., Rector of Great and Little Ryburgh; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of North Brisley and Toftrees.
Buckley, Rev. Charles Faulkner, B.A.; Rector of Southleigh, Oxfordshire.
Burn, Rev. W. P., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Wrancroft, Norwich; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of Norwich.
Bygott, Rev. J. Parkinson, M.A., Senior Curate of Fenton, Stoke-on-Trent; Vicar of St. James's, Newchapel, Stoke-on-Trent.
Cautley, Rev. R. H., M.A., Rector of Nesterfield; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of Ipswich.
Collinson, Rev. Thomas Harrison, M.A.; Vicar of Peters Marland, Devonshire.
Cowan, Rev. Robert David Russell; Chaplain of St. Lucy's Home, Gloucester.
Craigie, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Vicar of Kington; Rural Dean of Weobly III.
Dennis, Rev. George Theodore, M.A.; Rector of Hopton, Suffolk.
Fair, Rev. R. H., M.A.; Vicar of Wellow, Hants.
Faulkner, Rev. H. J. H., Curate of Lightcliffe, Halifax; Rector of Milburn, Temple Sowerby, Westmorland.
Fawkes, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Rothwell; Rector of Escrick, York.
Fox, Rev. George, B.A., LL.B., Vicar of St. Luke's, Gloucester; Vicar of Stroud.
Giffard, Rev. W. W. G., Vicar of Wootton, Ulceby; Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools, diocese of Lincoln.
Gray, Rev. Arthur St. John, M.A., Assistant-Master at Clifton; Head Master of Malvern College.
Haines, Rev. Samuel Charles; Rector of Luffincott, Devonshire.
Hayter, Rev. H. G., M.A.; Rector of Elmdon, Birmingham.
Henderson, Rev. James, M.A., Rector of Wallsend, Northumberland; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Newcastle.
Hughes, Rev. Thomas W., of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, Brecon; Vicar of Llangwrig, Montgomeryshire.
Hunt, Rev. Percy L., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Arundel; Assistant-Chaplain and Master of Blundell's School, Tiverton.
Jones, Rev. Peter, Rector of Llanddona, near Beaumaris; Rector of Trawsfynydd, Merionethshire.
Lomax, Rev. Henry J., M.A.; Rector of Ridgmont, Bedfordshire.
Maturin, Rev. B., M.A., Vicar of Lymington, Hants; Rural Dean of Hadingbridge East.
Mitford, Rev. W. L., M.A., Rector of Ickburgh-with-Langford; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of South Cranwich.
Morris, Rev. Robert Leslie, M.A.; Rector of Brooke.
Newbolt, Rev. W. C. E., M.A., Principal of the Theological College, and Canon of St. Paul's; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely.
Newnum, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Tilney, King's Lynn; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of Lynn Marshland.
Norman, Rev. Haswell William, M.A., Senior Curate, Parish Church, Huddersfield; District Secretary of British and Foreign Bible Society for Cambridge University and District.
Orford, Rev. H. W., M.A., Rector of Bradden, Northants; Vicar of St. Mary's, Leicester.
Quayle, Rev. D. F. W., M.A.; Rector of Trimley St. Martin, Felixstowe.
Rae, Rev. Charles David, M.A., Vicar of Newchapel, Stoke-on-Trent; Vicar of Silverdale, Newcastle-under-Lyme.
Robeson, Rev. Emming, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Tewkesbury; Canon of Bristol Cathedral; Archdeacon of Bristol.
Rycroft, Rev. Edmund Hugh, M.A.; Public Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Shaw, Rev. Alfred Havergal, B.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Canonbury; Vicar of Titley, Herefordshire.
Sikes, Rev. Thomas Burr, M.A.; Rector of Warbleton, Sussex.
Still, Rev. John, M.A.; Vicar of Netheravon, Salisbury.
Sturges, Rev. M. C., M.A., Curate of St. Nicholas's, Deptford; Chaplain of the North Surrey District School at Anerley.
Thicknesse, Right Rev. F. H., D.D., Bishop-Suffragan of Leicester; Rector of Oxenden, Market Harborough.
Walker, Rev. Gilbert, M.A., Vicar of Huttoft, near Alford; Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools, diocese of Lincoln.
Weber, Rev. George Henry; Chaplain at Godesberg, Germany.
Wilkin, Rev. W. H., M.A.; London Diocesan Home Missionary at St. Aldhelm's, Edmonton.
Williamson, Rev. William, formerly Head Master's Assistant at the Mercers' School and Curate of St. Mildred's, Lee; Head Master of the West Kent Grammar-scool, Brockley.
Wren, Rev. A. T., M.A.; Rector of Newton-by-Sudbury, Suffolk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Addison, Rev. John Dupré, M.A., of Ealing, formerly Vicar of Holy Trinity, Weymouth, at Worthing, on the 13th inst., aged 78.
Baber, Rev. Harry, Vicar of Ramsbury, at Ramsbury Vicarage, Wilts, on the 18th inst, aged 74.
Bell, Rev. John, thirty years Vicar of Fordham, at Fordham, Cambs., on the 10th inst., aged 70.
Bellett, Rev. John Crosthwaite, M.A., at 153, Holland-road, Kensington, on the 14th inst., aged 61.
Blatch, Rev. W., B.D., for twenty-five years Incumbent of St. John's, Perth, at Beckington, near Bath, on the 14th inst.
Cox, Rev. Robert Henry, M.A., Vicar of Hardingstone, at Hardingstone Vicarage, on the 11th inst., aged 80.
Du Boulay, Rev. Francis, fifty-two years Rector of Lawhitton, at the Rectory, on the 15th inst., aged 82.
Grace, Rev. Robert, late of Winchcombe, at South Northwood, on the 8th inst., aged 92.
Hall, Rev. George, Rector of St. Andrew's, Gympie, Queensland, son of the late Robert Hall, Downham, Northumberland, at 19, Fawcett-street, London, on the 11th inst., aged 41.
Harington, Rev. James Douglas, Longstanton Rectory, on the 16th inst., aged 54.
Lambert, Rev. Francis John, B.A., Halling Vicarage, on the 13th inst., aged 25.
Lanfear, Rev. William Francis, first Incumbent of Christ Church, Weston-super-Mare, on the 27th ult., aged 79.
Peete, Rev. William Willox, at 11, Dorville-road, Lee, on the 11th inst., aged 93.
Philpott, Right Rev. Henry, D.D., late Bishop of Worcester, at the Elms, on the 10th inst., aged 84.
Powell, Rev. Edward Armett, M.A., nearly forty-nine years Rector of Toft-with-Caldecote, Cambridge, at Caldecote Rectory, on the 10th inst., aged 85.
Reeves, Right Rev. William, Bishop of Downe and Connor and Dromore, formerly Dean of Armagh, on the 12th inst., in his 77th year.
St. John, Rev. Edward, for forty-eight years Rector of the Parish, at the Rectory, Finchampstead, on the 17th inst., aged 86.
Seacome, Rev. Albert Henry, M.A., at Eastbourne, on the 11th inst., aged 51.
Sheldon, Rev. R. W., for twenty-six years Rector of the Parish, at Bishop's Fonthill, Salisbury, on the 10th inst., aged 71.
Stonehouse, Rev. Joseph, Vicar, at St. Saviour's Vicarage, Nottingham, on the 4th inst., aged 54.
Swayne, Rev. George Carless, B.D., late Fellow of C.C.C. Oxon, at Portledge House, Bath, on the 13th inst, aged 73.
Taylor, Rev. H. B., Clerk, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, on the 14th inst., aged 50.
Topham, Rev. Edmund Charles, Rector of Hawkswell, at the Rectory, Hawkswell, on the 11th inst., aged 78.
Trotter, Rev. Thomas Lowis, for nearly fifty-one years Rector of Great Stainton, at Great Stainton Rectory, Ferryhill, on the 15th inst., aged 83.
Wade-Gery, Rev. Robert, formerly for upwards of forty years Rector of Colmworth, Beds, at his residence, Fernhill, West Malvern, on the 16th inst., in his 90th year.
Wawn, Rev. John Dale, Vicar of Kirkleatham, at Malvern, on the 11th inst., aged 62.
Wrangham, Rev. Digby S., M.A., Vicar of Darrington, at Darrington Vicarage, Pontefract, on the 11th inst., aged 60.

The Church of England Pulpit.

TWO ASPECTS OF DEATH.

By the Rev. Canon Scott-Holland, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, London.

Sermon Preached on the Death of the Duke of Clarence in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, January 17th, 1892.

"They were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a ghost."—Luke xxiv. 37.

"'TERRIFIED and affrighted.' There is the natural, normal, instinctive movement of the human heart, as it looks upon death, as it encounters the dead. In every age, and in every land, far and wide over the face of the earth, wherever man is left to himself, wherever his native impulses work unhampered, he shudders at the touch of the unseen world. We, ourselves, know how deep is that shudder. For indeed it survives the full counter-force of our faith. Our ordinary language, it is true, has been mastered by the transforming vigour of Christianity; and we have all learned to talk as if this earth were indeed a shadowy pilgrimage, beclouded, frail, unsteady, while beyond lies a glory shining through the golden gates—a land of living sunlight, of jewelled splendour, of unflagging hope, of dazzling joy, in heaven our home. Learned to talk! Yes; and though again and again, under the stroke of sorrow, the words sound thin and unreal, yet the vision has entered deep into our souls. Our imagination is steeped in its magnificence, the feelings fasten readily upon its beautiful symbolism. The broad contrast remains, with whatever quivers of apprehension, that after all (apart from the special cases where God has uplifted a whole nation, like the Egyptian, to apprehend immortality), with man, single, and left, as it were, to himself, earth is the place of shadows, heaven is the home of light and life.

"With us this is so far true; but with the natural man the contrast is wholly the other way: It is earth which is the sunny land, the bright land of light! Earth is the scene of men's vigour, their hope, their happiness. Earth is their one true home. Earth—dear earth—sweet, tender mother of all benign graces, where life moves free and full, where the blood runs high. Round this earth all their interests cling. Dear to them the blessed fields where they played and ploughed, and sowed and reaped, and gathered into barns. Dear to them the strong hills which sheltered them, as their fathers before them. Dear the flowing rivers and the moving tides and the leaping sea, and the rich plains, full of corn, and wine, and oil. And dear to them, too, the gay and happy streets of the home city, where men met men in the glow of brotherhood, in the freedom of citizenship. Earth is the land of light, of the sun; the true home, where the daylight is joyous and abounding. And beyond—night! bare, blind, black night. Aye, and worse than earthly night. No sweet moon, the faithful witness; no patient stars, sentinel watchers. No voice heard without speech, passing the word round, 'All is well, the night will pass. The day is at hand.' Nay, that night was moonless, starless. No sound, no shape, that told of its ever ending. The hand grasped nothing; the eyes strained in vain. An awful silence; a grim gloom. An empty, blank, meaningless abyss. Up to this all paths led; this black and dismal underworld of the dead. The dead! Once they had been as we are to-day—strong, glad, free, moving in the fulness of their manhood, until one by one the silent finger was laid on them—the chill struck, the tremor shook. White, weak, wan, they became. Cold, stricken, light died out of the eyes; love out of the face. There they lay, stark and dead; each a blind corpse. Call it; shake it. Can it tell you anything? Appeal to it by all that was once dearest. It lies there unmoved, impenetrable. Not a word, not a sign. Nay, even God was robbed then of His honour. 'The dead cannot praise Thee, death cannot celebrate Thee. They are out of remembrance and are cut away from Thy Hand. Shall Thy wondrous works be known in the dark, and Thy righteousness in the land where all things are forgotten? O remember how short my time is. Wherefore hast Thou made all men for naught?' Is there any life in them that go down into the pit, or understanding, or voice, or answer? Their hearts are still, their lips are shut. 'They go down like sheep; they are as grass which to-day is, and to-morrow is gone.' 'In the morning it is green and groweth up; in the evening cut down, dried up, withered.' So the Jew uttered with unequalled pathos the wail of the natural heart. He who loved life more than any, and would fain have seen such good days; he who understood better than any what life was meant for; how rich, how high, how noble its significance; he shuddered, with a peculiar horror at the dismal emptiness of hollow death.

"Had men no hopes—no outlook into immortality? Yes, this never wholly failed them. But still their dream was born of the night. It had the vanity of the night upon it. The life as they chiefly pictured it was no life—vacant, miserable, impotent, aimless. A poor echo of what had been their true living in the light of the sun, in the glory of daylight. A faint, fleeting realm of sad shadows full of the rich memories of the bright days on earth. A realm of darkness and of the shadow of death!

And in its vast and desolate hollows the dead were as ghosts!

"Ghosts! They cluster thick as bats in black caves—twittering with meaningless noises.

"Ghosts! wandering, perturbed, restless, around old haunts. Sad, forlorn faces, that peered out of Cimmerian mists over some ditch where the warm blood of life ran that they might drink of it and suck in some momentary draught of their old, sun-lit vigour! Frail, meagre spectres! So vague! So ineffectual! So melancholy! Look back to the warmth, to the lost days among their fellows. Looking back, with yearning desire, toward the empty chair and the hereditary hearth; and bitterly praying that they might be back again, if only as slaves, on the earth, where at least they knew the touch of pleasure and the joy of living:—

Better to slave on earth than rule in Hades.

"Ghosts! We know the dark terror that the word conveys even to us. We have still the old, sad stories, told and retold! It is a pitiful and gloomy scene out of which ghosts look in upon us. No happy laughter! No good cheer! No hope! A land of sad whisperings, of muttered sighs. That is the ancient emotion surviving in us—underground as it were. We are 'still terrified and affrighted when we suppose that we have seen a ghost.' We can understand why our fathers thought with pity of the dead ghosts that moved in that pathetic night, why they feared lest they should not sleep sound, and carried to their graves the food that once they had loved—the food that had built them up into something solid, real, strong, glad—the wine and milk and cakes—which now they might hover round with ghostly lips and might faintly touch and feebly enjoy—the shadow of their former selves—tasting the shadows of their former joys.

"So it had ever been, right up to the moment when the secret should break out. There in the Upper Chamber the old temper held its own among the twelve. 'They were terrified, affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a ghost.' Our Lord was dead as others had died. He was laid asleep. He, too, had found out also the rayless land of ghosts—that dim and hollow underworld. And not one of His devout and reverent friends dreams of any change in the old dreary hopelessness. No; their hopes, their thoughts, their imaginations have gone down into the grave with Him. They lie wrapped in His shroud—entombed in His sealed and silent rock. In the darkened chamber, where once He had eaten and drunk, had taken of the Bread and of the Wine, the men sit speechless, heart-broken, crushed. No ray of light pierces their gloom. It is buried for ever—all that they had ever hoped, all that they had profoundly loved. The bleak walls of the room seem to mock them with the echo of the voice which was still in their ears, saying—'Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you.' Ah! they only feel that they will never hear that voice again; and that, in the agony of that regret, all their peace has been taken from them for ever.

"So the men—without a movement, without a sound—sit on in the darkness of their despair. And the women—the women have no more hope indeed than the men. Yet their hearts failed not; pitiful compassion impel them to the one service yet left to them in their womanly faithfulness, in their womanly tenderness. They can still linger round the grave. They can still tend the poor, forsaken body—the body, which the Magdalene still calls 'My Lord!' 'They have taken away my Lord!'—the one, solid reality that she can cling to amid the shadows. At least it is something—to have it, to hold it, to wrap it in spices, to sit and weep where it lies. So they sit, buried in the gloom of the shadow of death, haunting the hollow chamber of a hopeless woe, sending out sighs and tears into the dim, unseen world of the ghostly dead.

"And yet it is no ghost that stands close to Mary's side, felt, in its near pressure, as a human presence. No ghost! but something steady, firm, substantial, real, as the gardener for whom she mistakes it.

"No ghost! with its quiet entry, its comfortable neighbourhood, its natural, unalarming voice, that falls on her ear with the solid fulness of any living human voice, 'Woman, why weepest thou?'

"It is no ghost: and no ghostly terror therefore invades her. No ghostly tremour shakes her. No ghostly strangeness chills her blood as she listens and hears her name—'Mary!' So it speaks in its habitual, familiar, intimate affectionateness. In a moment she is as calm and assured as if she had spent all her days with one dead and alive again. All fright, all trouble, has vanished as a dream; as she answers in a peaceful security that has ceased even to feel question or surprise, or curiosity, 'Rabboni!' No! And there is no quiver of hesitation, or doubt, or dread, as to what she may have seen or heard, as she passes to the Apostles the wonderful news. 'Then went Mary, and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord!'

"'She had seen the Lord!' She knew it! It was no spectral illusion, haunting in bloodless impotence the wastes of the dark house of the dead! It was the living Lord Whom she had seen, Whom she might have touched, had not He forbade her—touched, and held, and worshipped! No ghost at all.

"Nor was it some wandering ghost that stood in the Upper Chamber that evening, and breathed its breath upon them, and spoke of peace. No ghost that walked along the road with the moody twain towards Emmaus, at Whose words their hearts burned within them as they talked—He who entered in and abode, 'and was made known in the breaking of bread.' No ghost that called to the doubting Thomas 'Reach hither thy finger,

and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side!' No ghost that stood solid and firm on the sea-shore by the fire of coals, with the fish laid thereon, and bread, and Who came and took the bread and gave to them and the fish likewise. No ghost—Who, while they yet believed not for joy and wondered, took the piece of broiled fish and of the honey-comb, and did eat before them. No! Here is no weak and empty shadow of the life that had once been so real and so rich! No vain phantom, hovering in vague and dusky outlines round the spot where its days had ended. Here is no restless visitant, thrown out from some dark underworld, startling us in the night watches with disturbing anxieties.

"Here is a life, stronger, fuller, more masterful than the one laid down! Here is a life of substance and a light of power, and victory. Here is a life, which turns ours to shadow—a life which endures which is self-possessed, which is uplifted. Here is a life which comforts, calms, establishes, braces, supports. It enters upon us not to disturb, or to frighten, but to work upon us with energy—to breathe into us a new force; to change us from glory into glory.

"For a moment the disciples cowered with the ancient dread, 'They were terrified and thought they had seen a ghost.' And then the blessed news broke upon their ears, 'Why are ye troubled?' 'And why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold! My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself. Handle Me, and see, for no ghost hath flesh and bones as ye see Me have.'

"My brethren, we sit to-day under the cloud of death. Death is passing, like a shadow, over the length and breadth of the land. Its blight has fastened on our fields, and the pleasant lanes of our country sides are thick with funerals. Its hand is on our towns; in and out of the pinched cabins of the poor it is busy with this dread work, and the aged shiver and yield, and the babies wail and die. We who live sadly watch while name after name is struck off the roll of those that serve Church, and Queen, and country.

"And here, in London especially, we cannot forget the greatest name of all those who have ceased to be fellow-citizens and companions with us on earth—the great Cardinal, Henry Edward Manning. For more than fifty years that name has been familiar in the mouths of all Englishmen, since first he preached from our pulpits and ministered at our altars. Forty years ago he left us; and now we have ceased almost to remember how resolute and sharp was the war that he, a Roman of the Romans, waged in mid-life against the Church he had forsaken! so deeply have we learned, of late, to honour and revere in him the devoted adherent of all high causes, the ally of justice and of charity, and of heroic sacrifice under whatever forms humanity gave them birth, the friend and lover of the poor! Long he had lingered on, all but the last of the great race of those who were marked by the fires of that upheaval in which our Church gave to Rome so many of her dearest and her best. Still the clear flame burned on in him—vital, intense, sustaining, by its inward force the worn and feeble frame, until last Thursday (the 14th inst.), the soul slipped from its frail sheath. Still the body lies there under the silver crucifix, wearing yet its mitre, stole, and ring. But its long task is done—its labour is ended! 'He has gone home and ta'en his wages!'

"And almost his last word, ere he died, was of him whose young life was ebbing fast, and whose soul was to follow his, within an hour, through the grave and gate of death. It is of him, the young Duke of Clarence, that all your hearts are full. For him your eyes are wet; and what words of mine are needed to heighten the tragedy of his fate? It speaks, surely, of itself, with a force that no words could give it! Death has crowded into the brief drama of last week everything that fills our human days with pathos, with terror, and with tears. It is a throne which is at stake, it is a nation's hopes which are turned at one stroke of death's wings to dust and ashes.

"Ah! and yet, after all, that is not what makes it all touch home to-day with such tragic intensity. The time is long past when preachers thought it necessary to remind their hearers that death does not even spare the majesty of kings. We never doubted it. But the throne, in parting with some of its awe and supremacy, has drawn nearer to the sympathies and affections of the people. Kings and queens are men and women like ourselves—that is what we feel. And, in our day, our own Royal Family have appealed with peculiar frankness to this attachment. It has opened its doors; it has made its inner life known and familiar to us; it has shown itself as the first home in the land. A home—we know it as a home; with all the intimacies and tendernesses, with all the human-hearted associations of home. And it is a home, we feel, that lies shattered to-day before our eyes; a loved home, whose windows are darkened, whose joy is fled.

"It is a father of whom we think—a father who bows his head in anguish over his first-born, his heir, on whom all his hopes had rested since the first hour that he lay, warm and rosy, in the cradle long ago. What hopes, what cares, what dreams and schemes lie wrecked for him for ever!

"It is a mother whom we are all remembering, remembering with most wistful, earnest sympathy; that delicate and gracious lady, whom all love as a friend; so winning, so fair, so young still, who lies now, prostrate and broken, tasting such bitter sorrows, as only mothers know.

"Ah! and it is another, whose name is on every lip, whose grief is the spring of our profoundest pity—a girl in the flush of her first love, moving in the light of happy greetings towards the

near gladness of her marriage morn. It is she of whom we hardly dare to think but with whispers of anxious prayer, as they hide away unworn her bridal dresses, and lead her to take a last look at the white face that will never again brighten at her coming.

"And, on the throne itself, we feel the weight of desolation that has fallen on her, our Queen—she who first taught us to enter into the circle of her own home joys and sorrows—she who had hoped to see her children's children unto the third and fourth generation—she who has ever thrown such singular warmth of affection into all that knits heart to heart round the hearth of home—who now mourns with that most pitiful mourning with which the old bewail the swift passing of the young!

"The broken home—the cruel pathos of lost love. Who is not touched by such tragedies as these; and who is there to-day, therefore, who is not drawn by all that is dearest and tenderest in his being, toward the Court with such sorrows as these have darkened? 'One touch of nature makes the whole world kin!' A single pulse of emotion makes the whole kingdom one to-day. We all stand knit together into the unity of the Crown, by the passion of an irreparable sorrow! And, whatever be the strain or pressure which stormy years ahead may bring upon the empire, they will be softened and subdued by the imperishable memory of the day when princes and people wept together by the grave of the young Duke!

"But this cannot be the final message of the preacher! The solidity of the kingdom is interest enough; but there is a deeper interest yet in what has drawn us together—the interest of Death. It is to look into the face of Death that we are here. The common lot, the common dread, in which all humanity is one! Death! It is still terrible! It is cruel! It is bitter! And the darkness, the silence beyond death into which we peer is dreadful, as of old. 'Still we are terrified and affrighted.'

"Only One Figure faces our ignorance. Only One—that is not a ghost. Nothing else can we see, or know, or guess, or feel. It is hidden from our eyes. But One form stands, One voice speaks.

"One Whom we can know, and love, and understand, and Who says that He, in Himself, is all that we need know, or have, in that far land beyond death. He is what it is. He fills it. He is all in all of it. 'I am the Resurrection and the Life.' There is nothing there which is not His, nothing which is not included in Him. From end to end it will be He Himself, Who occupies, possesses, penetrates, vivifies, lightens it. 'The Lamb is the light thereof.' And this One, Who is ever there, is with us here. By you and me He has planted Himself. He is by our side as we walk. He is in our midst as we break bread. Where two or three are gathered together in His Name, He is there in the midst of them. Still right in the heart of our great grief, He is drawn nigh, though our eyes are hidden. He is here to-day among us, asking the quiet question, 'Why weepest thou?' Why is it that ye talk together and are sad? 'Why seek ye the living among the dead?' Why are ye touched? Why do questions arise in your hearts?

"Why? why? why? He is One Who has seen and known all. He has tasted the full bitterness of human sorrow; and yet He has passed beyond the sorrow, and, from beyond it, He has taken its measure and gauged the issue; and, so measuring it, so gauging, He cannot but wonder at our troubles and our tears. Some point there is which He has reached—has reached through woes as fierce as any that can assail us—some point of glory from out of which He looks, and is surprised why still we should be weeping, why still we should be sad.

"So amazing is the glory! So abundant is the kind joy! We cannot realise what it can mean, here as we hang round the tombs of our dear dead, here as we sit in lonely chambers and mourn out alone our unavailing grief. No, we cannot! But we can trust Him Who knows, for He is no flitting ghost, hovering with unsteady motion on the dim edges of the night. He is a living Substance, a vital Person, 'Who was alive, and was dead, and behold, He is alive for evermore!' Thousands upon thousands have trusted this pledged word, and found it true, 'I am the Resurrection! I am the Life!' He bids us try, test, prove Him. 'Yea, handle Him and see; for a ghost hath not flesh and bone as He has!' Oh, why should questions arise in our hearts? 'Why are we troubled and affrighted?' 'Christ hath risen from the dead. Christ hath become the first-fruits of them that sleep.' 'Henceforth we sorrow not for our dead as they that have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even them also which sleep in Jesus shall God bring them Him.' 'Not as they which have no hope'; for our hope is solid, assured, experienced, tested; seeing that even now, here on earth, we may take of His strength, of His comfort, of His life, and may know that He is even now abiding within us in power and in energy, Who will ever there be found to be our one light and our one salvation.

"Oh, pray we all to-day with one heart and one mind that they may taste of His present consolation who are desolate and bereaved over the length and breadth of England! Pray we one and all for the forlorn parents and the broken-hearted bride in their clouded Norfolk home that, through this sorrow, they may lay fast hold of that eternal life which is in Christ Jesus our Lord! And pray we this same Lord Jesus on behalf of all those gone from us in the hope of pardon, that He may have mercy upon them at that day!"

THE Third Sunday after Epiphany was observed as a Seamen's Sunday by ten Middlesboro' churches.

COVETOUSNESS.

By the Rev. GEORGE BLADON, Vicar of St. Luke's, Chadderton, Oldham.

Sermon Preached in St. Luke's, Chadderton, on the First Sunday after Epiphany, 1892.

"Take heed and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."—St. Luke xii. 15.

IN the passage from which our text is taken, we read that while our Saviour was teaching the people, one of His hearers interrupted Him with a request which we, I expect, should think very practical, "Master, speak to my brother, that he may divide the inheritance with me."

Now, this is almost the only instance recorded in the New Testament of any such request being made from our Saviour. But does it not seem to us strange that He was not more often asked to remedy grievances such as this man's, whose brother had wronged him—grievances which we commonly call practical? The people clearly recognised that Jesus desired their good; that He wished to benefit them; yet they scarcely ever seem to have expected from Him that kind of good which in the present day gains praise. And perhaps it may seem to some rather strange that our Saviour reformed no bad laws, though there were plenty then as now, that He put Himself at the head of no schemes for benefiting particular kinds of suffering, that He redressed no public grievances, and that on the only occasion when He was asked to interfere in politics He utterly refused. I think, however, it is not difficult to understand why. None knew better than He, who alone is the true Saviour of men, that not in these ways are men saved. Still, it might be rather an unpleasant thought for some of us, who boast of our increasing progress, of our advancing knowledge, to reflect that the well instructed artizans of Galilee—the Lancashire of Palestine—seem to have been quite content to listen to a Reformer who occupied Himself principally with religious teaching, and kept Himself entirely free from what we now call practical matters.

Then the common people heard the word of God gladly, and thought teaching of character and conduct quite sufficient; now a preacher is never so much praised as when he leaves the word of God and serves tables.

Still, there were practical, business men in those days as now, like this man who interrupted our Saviour with the request, "Master, speak to my brother, that he may divide the inheritance with me." But Christ refused, saying, "Man who made Me a judge or divider over you." Meaning, I have higher and more important work to do than to settle disputes about property; lawyers and law courts are competent to do that; I have come to preach the Kingdom of Heaven, which is not concerned about property, but about character—not about what men have, but about what they are; not about their wealth, but their worth.

Yet although Christ would not grant the injured man the favour he asked, yet He gave him something he needed far more, He gave him a little lesson which, if taken home and learnt, would not only enable him to bear his wrongs patiently, but also would be of lasting and abiding use to him by helping him to form higher and nobler ideas of life. He tells him to "Take heed and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." And then He added a parable, saying, "The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do, I will pull down my barns and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruit and my goods, and I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasure to himself and is not rich toward God."

Now if we had not heard this parable over and over again, so that by use and wont our ears have become dull and stale, if we could hear it now for the first time, or even if we would now set ourselves earnestly to realize what it means, surely it would startle us. It is just a picture of the life which I am afraid many are quite contented to lead, which men are even praised for leading, and which therefore we are all of us tempted to lead. It is not the parable of a bad man, like the prodigal son or the unjust judge; nor of an idle man, like the servant who hid his talent in the earth; nor of a heartless, cruel, man like the priest and Levite in the parable of the good Samaritan or the rich man clothed in purple and fine linen who let Lazarus starve at his gate, it is simply the picture of a man whose whole heart is given to the gains of this world; of a mere man of business, who can never raise his thoughts above his business. His lands had brought forth plentifully therefore, he thinks within himself and says, "What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my goods." Now is not this exactly a portrait of a man who has got lost in the business of life, so to speak, who can see nothing else, who can think of nothing else?

And are not thousands, both rich and poor, just in this sad state; and what is worse, are they not contented to be so; are they not excused, often even praised, for being so?

The world commonly thinks no harm of a man who gives all his thoughts to his business, although he never attends to anything else; who may indeed

come to Church on Sunday, but makes no spare time for Church work, or for classes or Bible reading, or for week day service; still less for literature or science or art or other means by which the mind — the higher, though not the highest, part of man—is cultivated and refined. The world says that such a man's whole time is occupied by his business, and the world thinks it quite sufficient to say that. It thinks that neither the claims of the mind or the claims of the soul should ever be allowed to interfere with trade, or business, or labour, or wages earning, or money making. And hence we see around us on every side the unlovely results of our modern civilization, at one end of society, a small class of rich, who have already more than they can possibly want of the so-called good things of the world, and yet can think of nothing better to do than to go toiling on day after day, from morn till evening, simply to turn that too much of theirs into still more; and at the other a large class of middlemen and poor, panting after them, eagerly anxious only after the actual needs of the body; both alike dead to all higher aims and purposes; so dulled and deadened by the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches, that they have no thought for the concerns of the Kingdom of Heaven, and have neither interest nor ideas about any other thing; all the beauty and nature of art, all the high and noble thoughts and ideas of master minds might be buried beneath the ocean's waves, and they would not even know, still less would they feel, that this earth had been robbed of all that raises human life higher than animal life.

And all for want of understanding and taking to heart our Saviour's words—"Take heed and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth." What is covetousness? According to the Tenth Commandment, where we are told not to covet anything that belongs to our neighbour, covetousness would seem to mean only the desire or longing for what does not belong to us. But just as in the Sermon on the Mount, Christ enlarged the meaning of murder so as to include hatred, and of adultery so as to include the lust of the eye; so here He enlarges the meaning of the word "covet" so as to include longing and desire for what *does* belong to us. "Covetousness which is idolatry," says St. Paul, rightly, for idolatry is simply the love of and worship of the thing rather than God who made the thing, and to covet, therefore, is to long after and desire and love any earthly things for our own selfish ends and purposes, rather than for the service of that God who made them. And that is exactly what our Saviour blames the man in this parable for doing. Not because his goods increased, not even because he would pull down his barns and build greater, but because his whole heart was given to his goods and the barns wherein he might place them —because he had neither thought nor care for anything else besides. Take heed and beware of such a life as this, do not set your affections and desires on such things — your true life is something far higher. Is it not so? That man, whether rich or poor, whose whole thought and desire is given to this world's gains and profits, what sort of a life, if it can be called a life, is he leading? Perhaps he may make much money, and with that money he may buy houses, lands, furniture, dress, luxuries, such things as money can buy—things, mark you, that minister only to bodily appetites and bodily pleasures, so far as they can be called pleasures. But if the whole heart is given to these things, what is happening the meanwhile? While earthly wants alone are being provided for, mind and soul are being starved, and they die; so that in the plain spoken language of St. Paul, the covetous man, the man whose whole heart is given to the world and the business of the world, is dead while he lives.

And when mind and soul are dead, all that can truly be called man is dead. Your lands, your goods, your money, your worldly possessions, when death comes—and death must come, and it may be soon—all these you leave behind you, but your mind, with all its longings, its ideas, its unsatisfied craving, and that immortal self which we call the soul, lives for the future world. In that future world, what you possessed in this, your lands, your goods, your money, will matter not one whit; but what you are will matter entirely. If in the too eager pursuit of this world's goods you have starved and killed mind and soul, then you must present yourself empty before God, worse than the slothful servant in the parable, you will have nothing to show for your life—not even your own talent in a napkin. Take heed then, and beware of covetousness; think less of the lusts of this world, lay hold, rather, on eternal life. While you are industrious and honest in business,—remember St. Paul has said he that provideth not for his own is worse than an infidel—you can make your business your servant, not your master. You may be successful in trade without sinking into a mere money-earning machine. If Cromwell's soldiers, whose backs no enemy ever saw, and who never lost a battle, sang psalms while they prepared to fight, surely we also even in the worry of our work may find time to wedge in some thoughts about whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report. This requires neither much leisure nor any higher education, though in the present day all can find some spare time, and all must have some education. Why not spend that spare time better? Use it wisely. Take it entirely from the world, give it entirely to higher things. Give to the newspaper far less time, give much more to wholesome

reading. Any book almost—any history, any science, any poetry, any tale by a wholesome author – is far better worth reading than a modern newspaper, full of the foul details of crime, the wrangling of politics falsely so-called, and the very silliest of scandal, useless even when true. Read, at any rate, read your Bible. Your Bible is an inexhaustible storehouse of wisdom and knowledge ; the revelation of God's works and ways which you will find there will raise your aims and hopes to something higher and more enduring than earthly goods and barns wherein to store them. And you can find there a remedy against covetousness, certain and unfailing, if you learn in those Scriptures which testify of the Christ, to become wise unto salvation, by following Him who alone gives the true riches, and in Whom alone is life eternal.

THE Bishop of Mashonaland, Dr. Knight-Bruce, is suffering from a severe attack of influenza at the house of his brother near Leighton Buzzard.

THE *Manchester Guardian* states that the Rev. Peter Jones, rector of Llanddona, Beaumaris, has declined the living of Trawsfynydd, Merionethshire.

THE Dean of Westminster has left England for a short visit to Egypt. All communications on Abbey business should be addressed to the Canon-in-residence until the end of February.

IT was announced on Saturday last that the Archbishop of Canterbury and family arrived at Tunis on the previous Thursday night from Algeria, and that his grace intended to remain several days there.

THE *Cambridge Chronicle* says that according to the latest news received from Canon Slater, who is now staying at Cannes, his health is undergoing satisfactory improvement, and he hopes to return to England soon after Easter.

ON Monday last at the evening service, the Rev. Edward Stuart Talbot, D.D., vicar of Leeds, was installed in the tenth honorary canonry in Ripon Cathedral, vacant by the elevation of Dr. Jayne to the bishopric of Chester.

THE Bishop of Liverpool was on Thursday, the 21st inst., unable to attend the usual gathering of priests whom he has ordained, owing to indisposition, but his lordship was reported to be slightly better on Monday, and was able to spend some time in his library.

THE appointment of the Rev. C. F. Buckley, mentioned in our list of preferments last week, should have been to the rectory of South Leigh, Devon, there being no vacancy in the parish of Southleigh, Witney, Oxon, to which through an error the appointment was stated to have been made.

AFTER nearly seven years spent in struggling against the hopeless legal and pecuniary difficulties which surround the position of Rector of Wymington, the Rev. J. Napleton has resigned the living. An address of sympathy has been presented to him, largely signed by the parishioners, who feel deeply for him, well knowing the many great difficulties against which he has had to contend. The gross value of the benefice is £3. 10s. a year. Even the Rectory House is in the hands of mortgagees, who claim an annual rent for it of £32.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mrr S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders fo. subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 30, 1892.

THE BIBLE AND THE CRITICS.

WITH the manifesto which has lately been issued by thirty-eight respectable clergymen we have so much sympathy that we hesitate to find fault. It is a great thing to have a profession of faith, and in so far as the pronouncement of these clergymen has strengthened the belief of many who before found their convictions difficult to justify, good work has been done.

Beyond this we cannot approve the manifesto. It was not particularly well-timed, it was certainly ill-worded, and, we must say so, it was ill-managed. No pronouncement, declaration or manifesto, about the Bible can carry much weight if it does not carry the signatures of the men in whom we put most faith in such matters. To mention no others, how can the absence from the document in question of so great a name as that of the Bishop of Durham be explained? The manifesto has too many signatures, and yet too few, when those of the greatest value are conspicuous by their absence the layman has to find reasons, and he has his choice of only two, either Dr. Westcott and other learned divines were not asked to sign, which betokens great carelessness, to say the least, on the part of the framers, or they were asked and declined.

As with the management so with the wording. No doubt the authors of the declaration meant to record their own absolute faith and reliance on the Word of God, and to encourage others to do the like. But they have done more; they have declared that the Bible is independent of criticism, which means independent of scholarship—they have not said as much in so many words, but that is the obvious inference from their declaration. Now what do they mean? And what do they mean by

the Bible? Do they mean the various MSS., Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Siniaticus, and so forth? These are the Bible in its original shape as near as we can get it. But these would mean nothing at all without the labours of the scholar, in other words the critic.

Do they mean, then, our English Authorised Version? That represents the Bible to the vast majority of English-speaking men, and probably will for years to come. And that is unquestionably what the declarers do mean. But how can that be independent of scholarship, which is in itself a monument of centuries of patient scholarly work, and which we owe, as it is now, to a body of scholars carefully chosen out of all the kingdom over? The declaration falls to the ground precisely where it is intended to be strongest. If it refers to the original MSS. it can mean nothing, if it refers to the Authorised Version it is appropriating and discarding the results of critical scholarship in the same breath.

It is difficult to say, in its details, how this declaration can be of any service to thoughtful readers of the Bible. The declarers probably intend to protest against the criticism commonly known as "negative." And yet some criticism must be negative—if there is any sense in such a term. For the most positive criticism implies a negative converse. There are points of "negative" Biblical criticism now absolutely established—the conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel being from a different hand, and many others—what bearing does the declaration have upon these? The declarers would not dispute them, yet their declaration does, though it is hard to say on what authority, for if it discards the labours of scholars in the present and the future so it must in the past, and that must in the end bring the unlearned reader back to the original MSS., which are unintelligible to him. The truth is, the declaration seems founded upon the popular theory that the Bible was originally revealed in the English of the Authorised Version—that is the only assumption which would enable us to dispense with the aid of experts—and plenty of people still believe it, or talk as if they did.

It is our own belief that the Bible has nothing to lose, and much to gain, from critical scholarship. In our own day we have seen adverse criticism fail and fall, and the most fierce of the detractors of the Bible, by their admissions, and by the limited scope of their attacks, have borne invaluable testimony to the genuineness in the main of what they endeavoured to damage in details. The Bible is true and strong in that conviction, we may leave to mutual self-confusion those varying disputants who for many irreconcilable reasons wish to demonstrate it false. But we can never do without the light of learning calmly shed upon the pages of the Sacred Word to the better elucidation of its meaning, to the clearing up of doubt and the making plain of what was perplexing. The scholarship which gave us our Authorised Version can never be dispensed with, it must go on to enhance the value of that great translation by appropriating the fruits of deeper research and fuller knowledge. Even the most conscientious and the most dignified of our clergy should not readily decry the noble labours which have run on continuously for so many ages, and are especially a source of pride to Englishmen by the association of such names as Wickliffe, and Tyndale, Lightfoot, and Westcott.

DEATH OF CANON CROSTHWAITE.

WE announce, with much regret, the death of Canon Crosthwaite, which took place on the 20th inst. at St. James's Terrace, Clonskeagh. During a life which outstretched the allotted span Canon Crosthwaite was recognised as a staunch and unswerving churchman. He was ever ready to contend for purity of worship and doctrine, and his busy pen was at all times available for the defence of the Church of his conviction and affections. He was a keen observer of current political events, and every movement tending to promote the welfare of his country and improve the condition of the people excited in him a deep and lively interest. His death will evoke a feeling of widespread sorrow among the members of the Church to which he gave so many years of useful and devoted service. More especially amongst the readers of the PULPIT who valued his sound and logical contributions.

THE COMPARATIVE CLAIMS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE MINISTRATIONS UPON THE TIME OF THE PARISH PRIEST.

BY THE REV. W. E. W. CARR, M.A., CURATE OF ST. THOMAS'S, WERNETH, OLDHAM.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE OLDHAM CLERGY SOCIETY.

"WILL you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within your cures, as need shall require, and occasion shall be given?" This question was propounded to us at the most solemn hour of our admission to the priesthood, to which we made answer:—"I will, the Lord being my helper." The pledge itself is an enormous one, even in the case of those whose cures consist of 2,000 souls, or so. How much more with our northern manufacturing parishes of 5,000 and 10,000! And, immense as it is, it is increased by the fact that it implies a two-fold responsibility towards that vast population which is placed under our care; first, that which arises from regarding them as one compact whole, the Body of Christ, of which they are members by virtue of their Baptism; secondly, that which arises from regarding them as so many individual souls for whom

Christ died. This two-fold nature of our pastoral work is again recognised in the exhortation preceding the admission to the priesthood, where we are warned concerning the treasure committed to our charge, first, that they *are* the sheep of Christ, which He bought with His death, and for whom He shed His blood (using the plural number); and, secondly, that the Church and Congregation whom we must serve, *is* His spouse, and His body (using the singular number); so that it seems to me that, looking on our work in its widest and most general aspect, we may be best described as firstly, Prophets or oracles of God, and secondly, Physicians of souls. These two offices express the two different branches of our work whose claims I wish to compare.

It would seem from the Ordinal that both these duties make equal demands upon us, and that our best course would therefore be a middle one, not giving more attention to one than to the other, but avoiding both extremes. This is very true; but, in hitting upon our mean, we must always be particularly careful to guard against that extreme to which we are naturally most prone, and I fancy that with most of us that is the extreme of sacrificing the private to the public ministrations. There are two causes for this. The first is our natural preference for work which obtains most recognition from the world in general, that which yields the most visible and tangible fruit, and that which, to use a common phrase, "gets a man on" most in the world. The second is, that public ministrations are recognised as the essential part of pastoral works by public opinion, and while a man who is not engaged in these is looked upon as no pastor, one who never engages in private ministrations holds undisputed possession of that title, through his engagement in the other. From these causes I conclude that private ministrations demand a far greater share than they already obtain of the attention of all of us, both beneficed and unbeneficed, for both are bound by precisely the same vows. Therefore, hoping it is not inconsistent with the title of this paper, I desire to pass over very briefly the claims of the other branch. By public monitions and exhortations I presume the Church means, in the first place, our public preaching in the congregation, which must be of unswerving faithfulness and impartiality, like the message of the prophets of old, who feared not to rebuke kings, for they knew that they were the oracles of God. Thus, says the Apostle, should the Christian preacher be. "If any man speaketh, let him speak as the oracles of God."

Leaving this, let us consider the other branch of our work, viz., private ministrations. First, their necessity. This is of course the greatest for those whom our public ministrations do not reach, who are of two classes: (i.) the sick, and (ii.) the indifferent. (i.) The sick people of our parishes are generally recognised as requiring our private ministrations, even by those who do not recognise the claims of any other class. They are easy to reach, and, as a general rule, comparatively simple to manage. We are not left to ourselves entirely in the management of them, our Church having provided us with a service which, though hardly adapted for use in its entirety at the present day, furnishes an excellent basis to go upon. Very often sickness opens out to us an opportunity for reaching the heart of a parishioner which nothing else would do; it may break down that huge barrier which seems frequently to intervene between us and our people, by showing them that we really have a deep longing after their spiritual welfare, and are not merely men paid to talk about religion on Sundays, as the general impression amongst our hard-headed mechanical parishioners seems to be. The fact that this opportunity is a talent that will have to be accounted for would alone render this form of ministration a necessity. But there is a further reason why it is so; and that is, that he who neglects this duty misses one of the most sanctifying influences of the pastor's life. The present Bishop of Truro says in his little book, "The Parish Priest in the Town," concerning the sick, "These are the very cross-bearers of our people, the living crucifixes of our parish, therefore they are sacred; they have much to give us, and we have more to give them; and, if we are true priests to them, there is something sacramental in their pain and weakness."

(ii.) Next comes a harder task, our dealing with the indifferent. We were warned on our admission to the sacred office that we were called "to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever." How else can this be done but by diligent private monitions and exhortations to individual souls who have gone astray? That word, "seek," implies something more than the mere providing of spiritual food in the Church, which they may obtain if they hear about it, or care to come for it. It surely implies following the steps of the "Good Shepherd," who leaveth those who are safe in the fold and seeketh after that which is lost until He find it. Hard as it may seem, even a forlorn hope, I cannot see how otherwise we can perform this duty which is binding upon us except by going in person to those parts of our parishes where intemperance, impurity, and all kinds of vice are most prevalent, and there, by faithful and earnest monitions and exhortations to individual souls, to seek (at all events) and perhaps to save that which is lost. I am well aware of the very great difficulties which lie in our way. When we go our evening rounds in order to catch the male portion of our parishioners, we generally find that the very men we wish most to reach are away at the public-house or club, and that the only ones we can see are the respectable stay-at-home birds. But I am in hopes that some of my brethren here, who have had such a much wider experience than I have had, will be able to give us some advice in this matter. Might not much be done by open-air preaching? Has any one here tried it? And if so, with what results?

So far we have considered the ministrations that are due from us to those who are beyond the reach of our public ministrations, but there is also that modicum of our regular and irregular Church-going parishioners to be considered. Does not our ordination vow bind us to something more as due to them than mere public preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments? Should we not seek to reach the individual soul by private words of "doctrine and exhortation taken out of the Holy Scriptures," as the exhortation in the Ordinal expresses it? If we are physicians of souls, surely we must mete out different treatment to the different kinds of patients who come under our care; and this can only be done by visiting them privately in their own homes, being mindful of the fact that our visit is really a ministration. I am unable to see how the ordinary friendly visit can be called a ministration at all. It is very pleasant as a relax-

ation from continued hard work, and also useful as helping us towards knowing something of the leading characteristics of our people, and breaking down the barrier that generally exists between priest and people; but I cannot see its use otherwise than as a prelude to our regular duties. Of course, there are great difficulties in the way of making our visits ministrations; but I think if we were to prepare for our visits just as we do for our other ministrations, and to conduct them on a fixed and regular plan, these difficulties would probably lessen, if not vanish. At least, so men of deep experience in this work tell us, such as the late Bishop Samuel Wilberforce. Might we not with advantage have some definite subject in our minds each day we go forth to visit our people, such as Holy Communion, Confirmation, etc. We shall probably find that the great number of people we visit neglect the one and despise the other. And if we are really enthusiastic in our belief in the efficacy of these means of grace, we shall probably be able to impart some of our fire to them, or at least to do the preparatory work of thawing their frozen notions of these sacred rites.

But I desire before closing to speak just one word on the limitations of these duties. The Church recognizes us as human beings, and so she only pledges us to the performance of this work as far "as need shall require and occasion be given." In a very large number of cases we have the need but not the occasion, in a smaller number we have neither the occasion nor, considering the circumstances, the need. In these latter I would include all regular attendants upon the ministrations of Romanists, Wesleyans, Salvationists, and the greater number of Nonconformist bodies. If we were crossing the stormy ocean in a strong and noble vessel, which we knew that nothing could destroy, and thousands were perishing in the waters around us, should we not consider that need required that we should throw our ropes and things to those masses who had nothing to take hold of to save them and not to those who had been already picked up, though by inferior and less seaworthy vessels than our own? If so be that we completed the task of rescuing these drowning ones, then would be the time to persuade those on board the others of the superiority of our own vessel. With regard to the other limitation, "as occasion shall be given," it is a much greater one. Even were this vow from which I have taken my subject the only one binding upon us, yet we should not have opportunity to use private monitions and exhortations to one half of the vast numbers which inhabit some of our parishes. But since we have pledged ourselves also to be diligent in prayers and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, and since those who have families have pledged themselves to be diligent to fashion those families according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make them wholesome examples and patterns to the flock, our opportunities are still further diminished. However, we shall be judged according to the opportunities which we have, and not those which we have not.

In fine, it seems to me that the great danger we clergy have to guard against is, that of giving the preference to the most showy and apparently fertile work. We too often judge of a man's failure or success according to the emptiness or fulness of his Church. I remember hearing it said of a most excellent and devoted pastor, formerly of this neighbourhood: "He was a dead failure—his Church was scarcely ever half full;" so I suppose the world passes, and always will pass, its judgment, free from care. But our work differs from that of all professions in that it is done directly for One Who seeth in secret; and so I think there is no profession to which the proverb, "Blessed be drudgery," is so deeply applicable.

I trust no one will think I wish to underrate public ministrations. I believe the Sacraments to be of the first importance, that without Baptism a man cannot be made a member of the Body of Christ, that without the Holy Communion he cannot continue a living and growing member; but I think that it shows want of skilful management in our sacred duties that we should be continually enriching and increasing the pasture within the fold, while the proportion of the flock to those wandering outside in the desert is ever growing smaller and smaller.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE THINKER." January, 1892. London: James Nisbet and Co.

MESSRS. NISBET AND CO.'S new venture is, we believe, to take the place of two serials that have had their day and ceased to be. That makes one magazine a month less, a distinct gain, for there are far too many.

The new comer ought, however, to have been named the *Surveyor* rather than the *Thinker*, for the articles are almost all criticisms of the writings or sayings of others, rather than fresh sparks struck from their own minds by the writers. This, however, is a small matter.

The *Spectator* rather bitterly said the *Thinker* might *think*, but it must be from an Evangelical standpoint. If this be so, to judge from the first number, Evangelicalism has mended its great fault; the fixed idea that it alone possesses the truth. But, granting that the *Spectator* is right, so much the better that there should be an exponent of the best Evangelical thought. High Churchmen have their say in the Church Quarterly; Liberals in the Edinburgh; it is very much to be desired that Evangelicals should be represented by something better than the merely abusive pamphlets in which we only hear the distant and random gun that a retreating foe is sullenly firing.

But to turn from these general remarks to the magazine before us. Most of the papers are able and on interesting subjects; we may especially commend Principal Chapman's remarks on "Mrs. Besant's Doubt, and her Interview with Dr. Pusey." The reviews are good, but we would rather have fewer and more thorough. There are also papers giving the current thought in England, America, Germany, and Holland.

We are glad to hear that the *Thinker* has reached a second edition.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"IS THERE A PURGATORY?"

SIR,—The long letter, of more than three columns, in the PULPIT of this date, appears to me to contain a strange mixture of blundering and bluster, scarcely worthy of a clerical pen. There seems to be, as before, a singular incapacity to give fair and reasonable ac-

counts about the opinions of authors quoted, or the statements of opponents. It is almost ludicrous that any one who persistingly manifests such qualities should ascribe "logical deformity" to any one else. I take the liberty to offer some comments on the part referring to myself.

The writer still asserts that the expressions which he professes to withdraw are accurate and true, and adds the gratuitous aggravation, that my objections arise from a wish to cover the nakedness of my logical deformity. The first expression was: "J. B. does not understand the authors whom he quotes." I referred to Jerome, as teaching the doctrine of universal restoration, which he denied, and thereupon I furnished additional quotations from Jerome's writings. I also gave passages from a recent book by the Bishop of Manchester, as plainly declaring that "unto the æons, means only a period indefinitely long." This he also denied, and in both cases asserted that I did not understand those writers. As he must now clearly perceive that this charge is applicable to himself rather than to me, a manly love of truth and equity ought to have prompted him to say so. The second offensive expression was: "His notion of universal restoration has its origin in his own intellectual confusion." I am entitled to ask, "What was the origin of the *same* notion, held and avowed by Jerome and the Bishop of Manchester."

He now says that on my own authority I assert that the original words rendered "eternal and everlasting" do not mean "endless." That is a very unfair and inaccurate statement. I brought forward quotations, not only from Jerome, but also from other eminent early writers, to show that they taught the doctrine of universal restoration. I drew the legitimate and irresistible inference that they could not have interpreted *aion* and *aionios* to mean endless. I also brought forward the explicit opinion of Bishop Moorhouse, that those words must not be understood as meaning endless. Yet this strangely constituted brain issues forth the declaration that I am making the statement on my own authority!

I submit to the earnest-minded men who contribute to the PULPIT, that if the opinion of the Bishop is correct, the English Bible gives very false impressions in relation to the inspired utterances on future punishments. I hope that thoughtful and fair-minded lovers of truth, will enlighten your readers on such momentous topics.

J. B.

Canonbury, January 23rd, 1892.

SIR,—I think it was said by Talleyrand, "Words were to conceal thoughts." I venture to express it thus: "Words are to misrepresent ideas." Whether the fault of a misplaced comma, I find myself not fully understood, but I do not wish to rewrite a difficult subject.

But I wish to make a comparison, as everything seems to me in Threes, *e.g.*, The world, the flesh, and the devil, and so on. Earth, Paradise and Heaven.

There must be some use in Paradise. Now we are born into the world and are treated as infants till we are twenty-one years of age. Another twenty-one years makes the average of life, and we pass away, infants still. Look at the child at twenty-one. He enters the world to find himself surrounded by many different views on *all* subjects. He finds himself misguided by friends, not intentionally perhaps, and finding this the case he determines to follow his own judgment, and to learn he is no wiser than others, and to blunder and walk blindly on, is the lot of all men. It was supposed after twenty-one years of school and college life that he would be trained and fitted for the world—but he has to confess his life a failure.

If for this world such is the lot of man, how can he be ready for Heaven? This world was his Infancy. Paradise (for the few with Lazarus); Purgatory (for the many with Dives) is his state of Manhood, in which he is trained for the third and last Estate—a position in Heaven.

There are some few who are called, in the world, successful men—and so there are a few who, in the Church, have won the race. They who have made their election sure, who have secured the "Now" of their salvation. Oh! happy ones and blessed!

My failures are grievous, and how are my uncertainties increased, when I may preach Liddon to-day, and Farrar to-morrow!

VICAR.

January 26th, 1891.

SIR,—In reply to Dr. Donaldson's very impressive, though altogether unconvincing letter in the PULPIT of the 23rd, I have to state that I have consulted Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon (fifth edition, 1861) without finding in it the derivation of *αἰὼν* from *ἀεὶ ὤν*. If Aristotle so derives it, this proves nothing; for the ancient Greeks studied no language but their own, and the roots of Greek, as of most other languages, are not to be found in the language itself. This etymology is probably on a par with deriving "climax" from "to climb," or explaining "tact" as an abbreviation of "tactics," derivations which might appear plausible to a person totally ignorant of any language but English.

Dr. Donaldson thinks the authority of the translators of the Bible in the time of James the First, who rendered *αἰώνιος* by both "eternal" and "everlasting" in the same verse (Matt. xxv. 46) is an authority beyond which it is needless to appeal. This excessive deference to the English is, perhaps, either the effect of his weakness in Greek, or its cause.

I do not speak without authority when I say that the primary meaning of *αἰὼν* is a limited time. Liddell and Scott give it in the first place as "a period of time, especially a lifetime." And the charge of our Lord to His apostles which concludes the Gospel of Matthew, ends with the words, "I am with you alway, even to the end of the age" (*τοῦ αἰῶνος*), which our translators, with perfect fidelity to the meaning, have rendered "the end of the world." The same expression occurs in his explanation of the parable of the tares (Matt. xiii. 39), "the harvest is the end of the world."

St. Paul's use of *αἰώνιος* is exactly similar to our Lord's use of *αἰὼν*. I will repeat the two quotations from my letter in the PULPIT of the 9th:—"His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before times eternal, but now hath been manifested" (2 Timothy i. 9, 10). "The mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known unto all the nations" (Romans xvi. 25, 26). In these passages eternal times evidently are the ages during which the world exists, and the expression, "eternal God," occurring in the same sentence with "eternal times," *which have already ended*, proves that the word, which is rightly translated

"eternal," is indefinite as a word of duration. With this before us, I see no certainty, nor strong presumption that the eternal punishment (or chastisement, as the word really means) denounced against the unmerciful, in Matthew xxv., must be of equal duration with the life promised to the merciful.

Further, the passage quoted above from the Epistle to the Romans is remarkable as being the only place in the New Testament where we find the expression "Eternal God." I will here refer to an admirable book, Jukes's "Restitution of all Things" (Longman, 1878), where it is argued that the title of "Eternal God," in both the Old and New Testaments, is used exclusively where God is working out His purposes of righteousness and grace through the ages, which were created through the Son (Hebrews i. 2), and will end when "all things are made new" (Revelation xxi. 5), and Christ shall "deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father" (1 Corinthians xv. 24) when the "restoration of all things" will come, "whereof God spake by the mouth of His holy prophets since the world began," and confirmed the same through the Apostle Peter (Acts iii. 21). Mr. Jukes's entire argument is scriptural, and no one can suspect him of rationalism.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, January 25th, 1892.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bell, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of the Vale, Guernsey, and Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral; Dean of Guernsey.

Blundell, Rev. T. B. H., M.A., Rector of Halsall, Honorary Canon of Liverpool and Rural Dean of Ormskirk; Honorary Chaplain to the Queen.

Boyd, Rev. George Kynaston, M.A.; Rector of Nuthurst, Horsham.

Buckley, Rev. Charles Faulkner, B.A.; Rector of Southleigh, Devonshire.

Burn, Rev. W. P., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Mancroft, Norwich; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of Norwich.

Cautley, Rev. R. H., M.A., Rector of Westerfield; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of Ipswich.

Cheetham, Rev. R. D., Vicar of Northwood; Surrogate for the diocese of Lichfield.

Collier, Rev. H. N., M.A., Vicar of East Finchley; Commissary for Newcastle, N.S.W., and for North Queensland.

Cruttwell, Rev. Charles Thomas, M.A.; Rector of Smeeton Westerby, Leicestershire.

Dandridge, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Vicar of Linslade, Leighton Buzzard; Lecturer in Pastoral Theology at St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead.

Eaton, Rev. John Richard Turner, M.A., Rector of Denton.

Fisher, Rev. F. H., Curate of Barberton; Canon and Precentor of St. Alban's Cathedral, Pretoria, and Curate of the Parish of Pretoria.

Gray, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Belgrave, Leicester; Vicar of St. Mary's, Peterborough.

Gregson, Rev. Charles, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces Third Class; Chaplain to the Forces Second Class.

Griffith, Rev. Frederick Seymour; Vicar of Southwick.

Henslowe, Rev. Edward John Lambert Barthelemon, LL.B.; Vicar of Preston-with-Sutton Pointz, Dorset.

Hopkinson, Rev. William, M.A.; Vicar of Sutton, Wansford.

Houghton, Rev. E. J., M.A.; Vicar of St. Luke's, Gloucester.

Howes, Rev. Leonard Plumptre; Rector of Fritton, Norfolk.

Hunt, Rev. Alfred, M.A.; Assistant-Master at Blundell's School, Tiverton.

Iddeson, Rev. William Parkinson, Senior Curate of St. George's, Battersea; Chaplain of the Middlesex County Lunatic Asylum, Tooting.

Jones, Rev. John Ireland, M.A.; Rector of Brampton, Norfolk.

Ketchley, Rev. W. Clement, Curate of Corfe Castle; Rector of Farmborough, Bath.

Knight, Rev. J. G. B., M.A., Rector of Middleham; Rural Dean of Catterick West.

Lancaster, Rev. Robert Wharton, M.A.; Vicar of St. James's, Aylestone Park, Leicestershire.

Lance, Rev. Edwin Mildred, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Langport, Somerset.

Lawrance, Rev. Joseph Glenn; Rector of Hatherne, Leicestershire.

Lloyd, Rev. L. W., M.A., F.R.G.S., Head Master of the Grammar-school, Ashby-de-la-Zouch; Chaplain of Ashby-de-la-Zouch Union.

Meade, Rev. Hon. Sidney, Secretary of the Salisbury Diocesan Synod; Prebendary of Netheravon, in Salisbury Cathedral.

Mogridge, Rev. Henry Twells, B.A.; Vicar of Scalford, Leicestershire.

Nash, Rev. James Palmer, M.A., Rector of Bishopstoke; Rector of Bishops Waltham.

Nickerson, Rev. David, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces Third Class; Chaplain to the Forces Second Class.

Pownall, Rev. G. S., M.A., Curate of Kensington; Resident Chaplain to the Bishop of London.

Price, Rev. Bartholomew, M.A., F.R.S., Senior Fellow and Vice-Gerent of Pembroke College, and Sedleian Professor of Natural Philosophy; Master of Pembroke College, and Canon in Gloucester Cathedral.

Raymond, Rev. P. F., M.A., Chaplain to the Forces Fourth Class; Chaplain to the Forces Third Class.

St. Aubyn, Rev. Ernest L.; Chaplain to the *Defiance*.

Southwell, Rev. Henry Kemble, M.A.; Rector of Chetton, Bridgnorth.

Smith, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Rector of Hapton, Norfolk; Vicar of St. Paul's, Birmingham.

Stitt, Rev. S. S., Curate of St. Mary-the-Great, Cambridge; Resident Tutor at St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead.

Talbot, Rev. Edward Stuart, D.D., Vicar of Leeds; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.

Thursby, Rev. Herbert Edward; Rector of Castle Rising-with-Roydon, Norfolk.

Tibbits, Rev. C. W., Curate of Christ Church, Coseley; Vicar of Elmton-with-Cresswell, Derbyshire.

Turner, Rev. Richard Spencer, B.A.; Rector of Huntingfield and Cookley, Suffolk.

Warleigh, Rev. F. L.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Lion*.

Welldon, Rev. J. E. C., M.A., Honorary Chaplain; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen.

Wood, Rev. Hugh S.; Chaplain to the *Blake*.

Worthington, Rev. Herbert Edward, B.A.; Rector of Cadeby, Leicestershire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bené, Rev. Albert Gardner, M.A., at South Acton, on the 16th inst.

Brown, Rev. Thomas Medlicott, Rector of Brandiston and Vicar of Haverland, at Haverland Vicarage, Norwich, on the 18th inst., aged 58.

Chamberlain, Rev. T., M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Senior Student of Christ Church, and Vicar of St. Thomas the Martyr, Oxford, for fifty years, at Hythe House, St. Thomas', Oxford, on the 20th inst., aged 81.

Crosthwaite, Rev. Charles, M.A., Canon and Vicar-General of Kildare, at 8, St. James's-terrace, Clonskeagh, co. Dublin, on the 20th inst., aged 85.

Hodgson, Rev. John Fisher, Hon. Canon of Chichester and late Vicar of Horsham, at Sunny Hill, Crawley Down, on the 21st inst., aged 79.

Hunt, Rev. Wray Richard, Vicar of Rocester, at Rocester Vicarage, Staffordshire, on the 22nd inst., aged 77.

Ratcliffe, Rev. Thomas, M.A., at the Vicarage, Godshill, I.W., on the 21st inst., aged 67.

Ritchie, Rev. J. J., Rector of Annapolis Royal, N.S., at Halifax, Nova Scotia, on the 22nd inst., aged 75.

Smith, Rev. Charles Septimus, Curate of St. Mary's, Lower Ince, Wigan, fifth son of the late Rev. Urban Smith, Vicar of Stoney Middleton, Derbyshire, on the 23rd inst., in his 41st year.

Townsend, Rev. William Manifold, at 59, Fonnereau-road, Ipswich, on the 22nd inst., aged 78.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CONFEDERATING FORCE OF SORROW.

By the Very Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

Sermon Preached in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, on Sunday, January 17th, 1892.

"Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep."—Romans xii. 15.

HUMAN society, in its many forms and groups, is held together by many different bonds. Some are or seem external to those whom they constrain; some are hidden in the inner life of men, in feelings or instincts too strong, perhaps, to be ever wholly forgotten or destroyed. And, as life goes on, we may be more vividly conscious now of one bond, now of another. The constraint of legal enactments may but seldom be felt by those who lead dutiful and orderly lives; they live under the shelter of their country's laws rather than are sensible of their pressure. But at times of great national peril or great national triumph, the common life, the deep traits of brotherhood that abide beneath the widest diversity of tastes, training, condition, and even of belief in the members of one nation, come, as it were, to the front; and men are keenly, enthusiastically conscious of a unity which in daily business and competition and contention they had almost forgotten. A city rises to a new understanding of the reality of civic fellowship and civic obligations as it seeks with one mind to do honour to one who has lived nobly and unselfishly among his fellow-citizens. In the spiritual society, in the Church of Christ, that deepest unity of the one life, supernaturally quickened and sustained, has seldom, I suppose, been realised so worthily, so thankfully in times of quiet and prosperity, as when the storm and rage of persecution, the piercing sense of the world's hatred, has urged together, heart to heart, those who owned one Lord, held fast one faith, and lived in the strength of one baptism. And so, too, in the narrower group of each man's home, many of us, perhaps, may know with what varying intensity the bond of family life is realised at different times. Even where no thought of coldness or severance has threatened it, it may for a while recede, as it were, into the background of our consciousness; it may but slightly tell on us, but rarely be recalled, till some eventful time, some change of circumstances, some common happiness, or hope, or fear, renews its force—the current flashes down the cold dull line, and all is aglow once more—and home sometimes becomes to men in later life even more than all it was in the days of childhood, with its simpler, readier, more careless pleasures. And these are but a few out of the many links which bind us one to another; links which make much of the nobility, and happiness, and strength of life; links which men may disparage, or laugh at, or trifle with, but in which religious men will see the hand of God, leading each one of us out of the misery of self-centredness; educating us in the ways of an ampler and more generous life; forming in us those higher characteristics which are part of our prerogative as created for society and mutual help; preparing us stage by stage for a place in the everlasting and perfect society of the city of God—"till in the ocean of His love we lose ourselves in heaven above."

By many different bonds society is knit together and life wrought up with life. But even when we pass beyond such ties as constitute the unity of nations or of families, we may find pledges of yet wider confederation, and forces ever ready to emerge and to assert against all the severing tendencies of human selfishness the truth of human brotherhood. God did not mean us to be selfish. And from time to time there break through to the surface of life the tokens of those deep sympathies which are always in the power of His grace bearing their inner witness against the wrong sin does to our humanity. Fellowship, kindness, unity, these are truer to the real meaning and capacity of human nature than the rivalry and harshness of clashing interests and desires. And sometimes, I think, we all may feel that this is so—when some arresting presentation of the reality of life and death helps us to be real—when, for instance, the solemnising influence of a great grief is telling at one moment upon a million hearts—when the tragic sequence of true love and sudden loss is held up before the gaze of a nation, and all men and women see, as it were, on the great stage of history, the sharpest misery that in their own lives they have ever known or dreaded. For then there comes a short silence in the clamour of ordinary work and play, and men have time to think; and one simple feeling, always noble in its simplicity, gains strength and volume as it spreads from heart to heart; and men are drawn near to one another, and know, if but for a while, the greatnesss of sympathy and compassion, as they yield to the deep, constraining bond of sorrow.

The bond of sorrow. Think how wonderful its power is within the circle of a single home. In many families, I think, the true meaning of home life, the virtue of the grace of marriage, is not known till sorrow comes. A husband and wife may attain to little more than that poor view of

their position which made a French writer speak of marriage as a dual egotism; but when the voice of trouble sounds, severely merciful; when sorrow calls each to help the other to endure, to be brave and patient for the other's sake, to forego the relief of tears, the security of silence, lest the other should break down or brood over the common grief; then the deeper and more spiritual truth of their union begins to be understood, and it seems strange that the mere pleasantness of the past events was enough to them. For sorrow has led them further into the reality of life; and there they have found something more of that great mystery of self-surrender through which men lose their life that they may find it, no longer merely as their own life and separate, but as fulfilled in and through the ampler life around them.

The bond of sorrow. We may see it sometimes in a sick room, in the presence of intense prolonged pain. It is a sight one never can forget—a memory which may go far to answer any perplexity about the problem of suffering—to watch how all ignoble thoughts will sometimes be dispelled and vanish in the room where day by day great pain is being borne—to mark the quiet splendour of self-forgetful, living service, never failing round the patient's bed—to see the beauty of character that is gradually disclosed or purified—to find how steadily the bond of sorrow is drawing closer and closer together those who but for its constraint might never have understood one another, never have unlearnt distrust and learnt the restful joy of sympathy.

But at times we see this strange confederating force of sorrow working on a larger scale. We see it strengthening with fresh meaning and reality the ancient ties which hold together the multitudes of a great nation. It is impossible, I think, to doubt that it has so been working in England during the last three days. This world of our discipline and probation is full of sorrows: I suppose no moment passes in which there are not hundreds of men and women whose hearts are breaking with some agony of which no history will ever tell. God only knows their sufferings in this present life; as only He discerns the glory that may hereafter be revealed in them. But it is with no forgetfulness of those unnumbered secret tragedies that we own a distinct power in the great sorrow of the past week. The death of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale has set before the attentive minds and hearts of England a sorrow in which no element of pathos or solemnity is lacking. That one should be taken from the vigour of early manhood, from the promise of an untarnished life, from the prospect of a vast work, from the fresh gladness of a true love—this would in any case be spoken of as a most tragic downfall of great hopes; and in his death all these elements of tragedy are gathered up, and a nation was watching for the issue when the blow fell. But one is thankful to mark on which amongst all these notes of especial sadness in his death the hearts of English people fastened immediately and have dwelt with strongest pity. For surely even his great place and vast opportunities, as he stood in the direct line of succession to the crown, have been less vividly, less often in men's thoughts, than the sorrow of the Queen, who told her people so simply that she prized her grandson's love; the sorrow of his father and mother, as how after hour they watched the waning of all hope that he might yet be spared to them; and her sorrow in whose love he had won what after all is the best thing that any man, be he prince or peasant, can ever win in this world. His high position brought their sorrow with unique conspicuousness before our eyes; but I think it is the sorrow, the real, simple sorrow, so great as to give no occasion for exaggeration, that has most deeply penetrated our hearts and filled them with sympathy and with reverence. And through the sad and deep experience of Thursday last we have surely felt with new intensity the bonds that hold us all together in the life of England. More quietly and gravely, but perhaps more lastingly than by the thrill of some great national deliverance or victory, we have been drawn together in the fellowship of sorrow—drawn nearer, I trust, to one another, so that it means more than ever to us that we are one great nation—drawn nearer, too, with a personal and affectionate sense of reverence and loyalty towards those who have not wished to hide from us the sorrow of their home.

Sorrow is, indeed, all round us in these wintry days, and we need to be often praying for one another that God may give to each the strength he needs to bear his share of trouble and the light he needs to see its meaning and to use it rightly. And as we so pray let us look often to the Cross of Christ our Lord, and let us think again and again what it means that He was pleased to come among us as the Man of Sorrows. For so His example and the assurance of His perfectly understanding us comes to us most readily and directly just when we most sorely need it. If He had gone through the years of His earthly life as a great conqueror, triumphant, radiant, with the voice of joy and health ever ringing round Him, in how much of human life it would have seemed difficult to realise His sympathy. But when we see Him poor, despised, rejected, bearing our sorrows, weary and suffering and in agony, crying at His friend's grave and for the doom that was coming on the city of God, hanging on the Cross, and commending His blessed Mother to His disciple's care before He dies, we may feel the tenderness of love which made Him choose to be so near us in our need, and the penetration of His entrance into our lives; and we may find, God helping us, that there is in sorrow a power to bind us closer, not only to one another, but also to Him, our victorious and ever-living God.

THE CHURCH OF GOD.

By the Rev. Canon CROZIER, D.D., Vicar of Holywood Parish, County Down, Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Armagh, and Chaplain to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Sermon Preached in Holywood Parish Church, County Down, at an Ordination held by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, on Dec. 20th, 1891.

"How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God."—1 Timothy iii. 15.

THAT our blessed Lord left behind Him on earth an outward and visible Church, ministered to by men specially appointed for that purpose, is plain to any honest reader of the New Testament. The Acts of the Apostles and the pastoral Epistles of St. Paul are the historical records of the establishment and development of regulations and discipline for the perpetual governance of that society.

The Church of Christ is no "fortuitous concourse of spiritual atoms"—no voluntary association of isolated individuals for religious worship. We are members of a divinely-established society; we are citizens in a kingdom founded by Christ Himself. It is, indeed, true to say that ever since the call of Abraham the Church of God has been in the world an external commonwealth, with its laws laid down by God. In Genesis and Exodus we see how God selected one man, afterwards one family, afterwards one nation, to be the head of a new dispensation, separated, in spite of weakness and sin, to be the household, the Church of the living God. This society, founded with Abraham as its head, was to be in the Old Testament what the Church of Christ is now—a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, the pillar and ground of the truth, the home in which to shelter the family of God.

God appointed a definite and distinct mode of entrance into this society of His—a sacrament of admission into His family; and the one who was not a sharer in that early rite, even though it were through no fault of his own, was cut off from the privilege of sonship—"The uncircumcised man-child shall be cut off from his people—he hath broken My covenant." The society or family was far from being an ideal or a perfect body. Again and again they rebelled against their God and disobeyed His law. Yet they were still His Church. In Isaiah's time, in the days of Jeremiah and Malachi, in the worst days of national apostasy, they are thus addressed: "I have nourished and brought up children, but they have rebelled against Me." "Israel is My son, My firstborn." Then the time came, as so often foretold by the prophets, when God would enlarge His household, His family, His Church—when it should contain, not one people only, but all nations should flow into it—"God did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name"; and a change was effected in the mode of admission into the Church. Baptism was substituted by Christ Himself to take the place of circumcision. And with the new entrance a vast expansion took place. The Church in Abraham's time was limited to his descendants. After Christ's ascension the gates are thrown back that shut out the other nations of the world, and there is no longer Jew or Gentile, bond or free, but all are one in Christ Jesus.

A little study will show that there are not two churches of God spoken of in the Bible, just as there are not two ways by which men can he saved. "The Church in the wilderness," as St. Stephen calls the Israel of God, and the Church in the catacombs, and the Church in this nineteenth century of the Christian era are all one and the same. There are two illustrations used by St. Paul that seem most clearly to establish this point—two figures of speech under which he describes our present position as Christians, which have absolutely no meaning under any other hypothesis. You find the first in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where the Old Testament illustration of an olive-tree is applied to the Church of God. Some branches are broken off by the head gardener because of their worthlessness, and others are graffed in to partake of the sap and nourishment from the tree. Israel is the branch cut off; Gentile nations are graffed in. "Thou being a wild olive-tree wert graffed in, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree." "Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." Here is the one Church into which believing Gentiles were adopted to share its spiritual blessings, even the glory, the law, the service of God, and the promises, so that we to-day are actually elsewhere called "the children of faithful Abraham." The other illustration is a still more forcible one, from Galatians iv. Here St. Paul speaks of the heir to an estate; he is under tutors and governors till his majority is reached. Then he is freed from the tutor, and takes possession of the inheritance. Mark, there are not two individuals, but one. There is the same child under the rigid discipline of the tutor, and arrived at maturity under the freedom of the Gospel.

The law of Moses was an interlude—a parenthesis, as it were, in the training of the Church of God. The duty of the pedagogue is done when he has led his pupils to Christ; and plain as plain can be is the charter of the newly-found manhood announced by Christ Himself, along with the universality of the old but ever new society—"Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Need I stay one moment to show that the Church

of which the Bible speaks is an outward and visible society, governed by laws, presided over by duly-appointed agents, and that it includes the whole body of those who accept Christ as their head, and who have been baptised into His communion. There is no phrase found more frequently on the lips of Jesus Christ than the one which speaks of "the kingdom of God" and its establishment as the great object of His life and work. He defines, too, what the expression means. Parable after parable sets before men this kingdom, this society, as a mixed body of men—some true, some false, some to be accepted in the great day of his coming, and some to be cast out into utter darkness, where all life dies, and all death lives.

It is a draw-net cast into the sea, which hauls in fishes of every kind, not to be separated till the ship has reached the harbour. It is like to a field of wheat with rank and noxious tares growing there which cannot be rooted up without danger and loss. "Let both grow together until the harvest—the harvest is the end of the world." The relationship between the Church and Himself is described by the blessed Jesus as that of a vine and its branches. "I am the vine, ye are the branches"; but there are fruitless and useless branches there, as well as fruit-bearing branches. There are branches reserved only for the fire of God, as well as branches full of fruit to the glory of His name.

Men's eyes had been turned all through the ages to look for some such society in the centre of the world. The mountain of the house of the Lord that had been hedged round and fenced was to be established in the top of the mountains, and all nations were to flow into it. Its members should be all the world over. A sense of comradeship should pervade all its sons—a sense of common brotherhood should make men feel they were not as one writer puts it,* "solitary knights tilting single handed, and often defeated at whatever enemy one chances to meet on one's little acre of life, but members of a mighty army marching through all time to a certain victory." Nor need the failure of men to live up to this ideal make men doubt of God's eternal purpose. It was so, too, St. Paul tells us in the earlier Church of Old Testament times. No greater or grander promises could be given to members of that Church than God gave to the sons of Israel; and yet how many fell short of their attainment. "They are not all Israel who are of Israel." "They were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, but with many of them God was not well pleased." And yet it is, indeed, much that God sets before men an aim such as we see in the ideal Church of Christ. Well, that we pray for the infant just grafted by baptism into the Church of God that he may "lead the rest of his life according to this beginning," and well, too, that having taught the Christian child first to lisp the words, "Our Father, which art in heaven." We teach the child still further to thank God for these great benefits, and to pray that he may "continue in the same unto his life's end."

Further, with regard to this outward and visible Church of Christ two things are definitely and distinctly set forth in the New Testament that we cannot neglect or ignore without danger and loss—first, the organic unity of the Church. The prayer of Christ on this point is far too definite to be explained away—"That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." And this is the desire of our Lord for the present not merely for the future of His Church.

Oh, friends, how sad and sorry a spectacle divided Christendom presents to-day. How many rents in the seamless garment of Christ. How truly might St. Paul say of us, as of the men of Corinth 1,800 years ago, "Is Christ divided—was Paul crucified for you?" Schism means weakness—schism means an uncertain witness in the world—schism means to distract men's thoughts from the greater issues of this world and the next to the lesser claims of a narrowed and exclusive and self-made brotherhood.

For it was not, as so many imagine, union in difference for which Christ prayed. It was for one fold under one shepherd such as existed at the start at any rate, when men worshipped all together and ate of the one bread and drank of the one cup, and acknowledged one visible society in each place as the Church of Christ there, and owned one visible head in each city or district or town, as we read in the Revelation of St. John, when Church government had become more settled in the larger centres of Ephesus, Sardis, Laodicea, and other cities in Asia Minor, where one ruler, or angel, or bishop is held blameworthy for the sins into which his charge had fallen.

The Church was then, at any rate, like a city set on a hill, to attract men by the very sight of its oneness, and so win them to believe in the unity of God. Secondly, it is no less plain that the teaching of the Church's organic oneness is directly followed by clear and unmistakable directions as to its guidance and governance. It is in immediate connection with the unity of the Church in her common faith and in her holy baptism that St. Paul goes on in the 4th chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians to speak of the settled and ordained ministry as the great gift of the blessed Jesus to this Church of His. The apostles, and prophets, and evangelists, and pastors, and teachers—these are all the special gifts of Christ, and given, as he tells us, for the very purpose of establishing and strengthening that unity of which he speaks—"For the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ

* Drummond.

till we all come to the unity of the faith and to the knowledge of the Son of God."

We live in a time when error is often met with on the one hand or the other as regards the origin and scope of the Christian ministry. On the one hand of ignoring it altogether as a "man-made" ministry, reducing it to the level of a merely human ordinance, and of an ordinary profession, as if each man whose pride or whose piety moved him had, at least, an equal claim to appear as the ambassador and the messenger of Christ; on the other hand, of clothing it with powers and prerogatives which cannot be claimed without arrogance or exercised without peril and guilt. On the one hand, we have men who deny to the Christian ministry its Divine appointment, authority, and permanence; and, on the other hand, those who claim for it sacrificial and judicial functions. It is the glory and boast of our Reformed Church that in avoiding both extremes it sets before us only what God has appointed and as He has ordained it. You have a very striking contrast and comparison in 1st Corinthians, ix. 13, 14, between the ministry under the law and under the Gospel—"Know ye not that they which minister about sacred things eat of the things of the Temple, and they which wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar? Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the Gospel should live of the Gospel." The Apostle argues for the support and maintenance due to the Gospel ministry from the provision divinely ordained for the Jewish priest. Under the Jewish ritual they who administered at the altar had a share with the altar—that is, had a share of the sacrifices for their personal use, and were in other ways provided for; and, inasmuch as God has made a provision for both, in neither case was it a human but a Divine ordinance, and of the one even as of the other it hath been said "He that heareth you heareth Me; he that despiseth you despiseth Me." Then you have the contrast lying in the different functions of each. In one case, "they wait at the altar," in the other "they preach the Gospel." The essence of the Jewish was sacerdotal; the essence of the Christian is evangelistic. The one mainly had to do with sacrifice and offerings; the other mainly has to do with the authoritative proclamation of the Gospel of peace, with the authoritative announcement of God's promised forgiveness to His people being penitent.

Nor are we left uncertain as to what the Apostles understood Christ meant to be the future government of His Church. They held His promise of a never-ending presence while the world lasted to warrant them in establishing an ordained ministry in all the churches which they founded. They saw without doubt in the person of the chief pastor, or angel, or bishop in each Church centre the best safeguard against error and division, and laying fast hold upon the promise that against His Church the gates of hell should not prevail, the Apostles ere they passed away chose others in their stead to become the guardians of the Church's oneness. "The things that thou hast heard of me," wrote St. Paul to Timothy, "the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." And so the Church's Lord has linked on the Church of the earliest days with the Church of to-day, not alone by the inward presence of the same Holy Spirit, but by the historic continuity of that Church from the Apostles' times till now.

Further, I think we find that the sacred writers in the Acts or in the Epistles require from ministers of Christ just what our Church requires to-day from those who desire to minister within her fold—first, that men should be called by the inward voice of the Holy Spirit; and, secondly, set apart by those who have public authority given unto them "to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

No more solemn question could be asked of any man than that question in the ordering of deacons, to be addressed so soon to some of you, my brethren, and to which others of us have answered in days gone by—"Do you trust you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration to serve God for the promotion of His glory and the edifying of His people." In the simple words "I trust so" you express your humble belief that the Holy Spirit of God is calllng you to be labourers in the vineyard of God. It has not been for you any vivid and sudden revelation of His will, such as singled out Saul of Tarsus to be an Apostle of Jesus, but it has been the very same leading and guiding hand of God as has marked and mapped out for you all your life work. In your home, at school, and in college your minds have been directed to the thought of working for God and man as ministers of the Gospel, and every fresh year the resolve grew deeper and the desire all the stronger while you turned your studies and your thoughts this way to obey the Divine leading. It may be that oftentimes thoughts of your own unworthiness almost compelled you to turn one side, as with Sir Percivale in "The Holy Grail"—

> Every evil word I had spoken once,
> And every evil thought I had thought of old,
> And every evil deed I ever did,
> Awoke, and cried, "This quest is not for thee."

But God's own voice spoke with you as the holy hermit spoke to him—"Thou thoughtest of thy prowess and thy sins, thou hast not lost thyself to save thyself, as Galahad. The voice said, "Whom shall I send; who will go for us?" and, in spite of felt weakness and well-known sinfulness, you can answer still, "Here am I, Lord, send me." And why? Just because you *have* seen the King, the Lord of Hosts; just because you *do* know something of the holiness and power of God; and because the Spirit of God has fired your lips, and nerved your arm, and stirred your heart with the knowledge of His love.

But it is not only that men are inwardly called, but also that men should be duly set apart for their work in the Church of God. The preface to the ordinal states what is only an historical fact, and capable of proof, like any other fact of history, that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests and deacons." Whether it be necessary or indispensable to follow apostolic precedent and the early Christian Church or not, we need not stay to inquire, but the fact remains. We can see in the brief space of the New Testament writings the gradual introduction of a settled government over the Church of Christ. At first Jesus Christ Himself was the visible Leader and Head, and under Him the twelve Apostles and the other seventy disciples. After His ascension into heaven, and when, by the descent of the Holy Spirit, the little band of new believers had been welded into one solid and compact body, then we find the discipline, teaching, confirmation and distribution of alms exercised by the Apostles alone, till discontent and disquiet in the Church necessitated the introduction of a new order of deacons for special and duly ordained work. When we turn on to the Epistles to Timothy and Titus we have directions given to them how to set in order the Church of God—what sort of men they are to ordain, how they are to leave rulers in every city to take their place, and under them an order of Presbyters and deacons, whose duties were specially appointed for them. Questions of dangerous uncertainty are decided by a Church council held at Jerusalem, with the bishop of that city in the chair. St. Paul's letters are clear and explicit. He directs Timothy as to the care to be taken in conferring of holy orders; he speaks with strange exactness of the way in which Timothy himself had been set apart for his office. The Apostle St. Paul is the instrumental cause, the Presbyters assisting are by him. In 2 Timothy i. 6, he tells him to neglect not the gift which was in him διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως by means of—or, "through" my hands, as in the revised translation. In 1 Timothy iv. 14, he reminds him that the gift came to him also with the assistance of the Presbyters present; and the prepositions in the Greek are in each case strikingly accurate μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως. "With the laying on of hands of the Presbytery."

We thank God that we recognise in the twofold expression, exactly our ordination to the priesthood by the bishop, and with the assistance of the Presbyters standing by. And it is well, indeed, for you, my brethren, to know in the time to come, when the weight and responsibility of your holy office almost bears you down, that you have been called of God by His duly accredited agent to labour for Him in the sacred ministry of the Church. You are no free lance in this great battle, you are solemnly called of God Himself. Well do I remember one of the most successful ministers I ever heard, say that he often almost failed to utter a word in his pulpit ministrations, or by the bedside of the dying, till the solemn words in the ordination to the priesthood and the promise they contained flashed into his mind, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God." Not, of course, the Holy Ghost in His sanctifying and cleansing power; not the Holy Ghost in His presence in your heart, which has already led you to come forward here to-day, but the Holy Ghost for your special work, the gifts and graces that you need for the office of a priest in the Church of God; and if Joshua long ago was full of the Holy Spirit of wisdom, because Moses had laid his hands upon him, you may well believe that these words to-day are no unmeaning form, but the expression of God's will concerning you—the prayer of faith that will not be spoken in vain. And now, brethren, you are to be messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord. You are to warn the unruly, to comfort the feeble-minded, to be patient towards all men. And, when here and there, it seems to you as though the children of the kingdom were little better for your labours and your prayers, still remember this, you can only see one tiny spot, and not the whole of God's great plan. You can only work in one narrow corner of the Master's vineyard, where weeds and noxious herbs may seem most rank. But look on beyond the present to the picture of the Church of Christ, as she shall yet be seen. Look on! as St. John rolls back the veil, and shows you through the gates ajar a vision of that Church of Christ when your Lord shall come—the peerless city whose gates are never shut, and where night can never enter—the Bride of Christ all glorious within, and her clothing of wrought gold; a great multitude which no man can number arrayed in white robes and palms in their hands. And as the vision deepens for you through the mists of time hearts are brave again, and arms are strong. You are working for a Master whose success is sure. You are sharers in a battle where victory is already won, only be it ours not to faint or grow weary while the day of service lasts:—

> Think not of rest, though dreams be sweet,
> Start up, and ply your heavenward feet
> Is not God's oath upon your head,
> Ne'er to sink back on slothful bed,
> Never again your loins untie,
> Nor let your torches waste and die,
> Till, when the shadows thickest fall,
> Ye hear your Master's midnight call.

THE Rev. T. Storrs, head master of Doncaster Grammar-school, who had consented to preach one of the opening sermons at the newly erected Presbyterian Church in the town, received an inhibition from the Archbishop of York. Notwithstanding this, says the *Manchester Guardian*, Mr. Storrs preached on Sunday afternoon week according to arrangement.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1892.

THE REV. C. H. SPURGEON.

MEMOIRS, reminiscences, sketches, anecdotes of the great preacher who has gone, have been plentiful during the last week. They are all very much the same in character. Mr. Spurgeon's life had not been eventful, and all that was to be known about him has been known any time these twenty years. He was not a great controversialist, like Cardinal Manning, nor a great theologian like Bishop Harold Browne, nor even a famous and polished orator like Canon Liddon. Each of these men, in his own line, was more than Spurgeon, and yet held a less important place than the man who for upwards of forty years has been an institution more than a feature in English religious life.

The remarkable fact in Spurgeon's career is not so much what he was, as what he was not. He was not a scholar, not even a student; he was not a theologian, he can scarcely be called a thinker, and he was confessedly not an orator; he was conspicuously without the very gifts which are necessary to lead and control and develop the thoughts of men. The strength of the man lay in his intense belief and his ardent sympathies. He came to London as St. Paul came to Corinth, determined to know nothing but just the one message, and to execute nothing but the one mission—to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. He was a prophet, in the right sense of the word, a man who "spoke out." He was the spokesman of every man and woman who was sorry for sin, and who was hungry and thirsty for righteousness. As an exponent of the faith and conviction of others he was unrivalled.

Beyond that Spurgeon did not go, his mission was not constructive. With the problems which have long perplexed many of us he was not concerned. The march of science, the advance of learning, passed him by; with him pre-eminently what was true was not new, and what was new was not true. As a champion of Christianity against both honest doubt and hostile scepticism Spurgeon would have been nowhere. If Mrs. Besant had gone to him instead of to Dr. Pusey she would have met with the same reception. He had no sympathy with doubters and unbelievers unless they came ready to be convinced. Three centuries ago he would have been burning heretics, if he had escaped being burnt as one. He did not grow narrow, like so many great men, as he grew old; he never changed, never progressed. That has debarred him from exercising any marked influence upon the thought of his age. It is wonderful, for instance, how little impression his censure made upon the general tendency towards liberality of expression and opinion in his own community which he stigmatised as "down-grade" theology; even his unbounded authority and tremendous prestige failed, in his own immediate circle, to arrest a movement which was none the less detestable to him because it was natural and inevitable.

Spurgeon had other work to do, and he did it well. It was his business to bring back prestige to the pulpit and enthusiasm to the pew. No man has done that better. The power of the pulpit, when occupied by a man of earnestness, of enthusiasm, and of sound common sense, could never be despised so long as every week ten thousand people gathered to hear Spurgeon's voice, and twenty-five thousand more hastened to buy his sermon. It was his business to free the pulpit from conventional trammels, to bring it into touch with the ordinary affairs of human life and the simple emotions of simple people. Without being at any pains to re-state and re-form, he brought to bear upon the religion which he found ready made all the resources of a mind distinguished for keen sympathy, quick perception, deep insight, ready wit, and good business capacity. Spurgeon could play upon all the emotions and press them all into the service of his appeals. It was possible to remain unconvinced after he had preached, but quite impossible to be inattentive while he was preaching, or to feel personally unconcerned at what he said. There was a marvellous lift about it, an aspiration, a consecration of common things; he would preach a sermon to servant girls, which would illuminate the most trivial details of domestic drudgery with rays of holiness, as a sunbeam makes the very particles of dust dance like fiery gems.

Spurgeon's unique prestige and special personal gifts would have assured his position as long as he cared to hold it, but already the cleavage had come. As time went on the tide of opinion would have ebbed further and further away to leave him

stranded, like some noble ship, which has proved no longer equal to the stress of weather and of stormy seas. But he had done noble work—it was indeed a consecrated fire which touched his lips. To other men may be the glory of moulding the forms in which may be cast the faith and hope and aspiration of future generations. It is Spurgeon's that he has ennobled the lives and elevated the thoughts of thousands, perhaps millions, in his own; he has lifted up the things of earth into the bright light of heaven; he has come and stood over humanity, scraping towards itself the sticks and straws of its own petty impulses and affections, and forced it, for the time, to drop the muck rake and look up towards the celestial crown.

THE RECENT PEACE CONGRESS AT ROME.

IT is to be regretted that the Christian Churches generally, with the exception of the Society of Friends and several Baptists and other Non-conformists, were scarcely represented at the recent Peace Congress held at Rome. An Italian speaker reproachfully drew attention to the circumstance that not a single Catholic priest was in attendance at the assembly, held at the very seat and centre of the Roman Hierarchy. Not one word came from distinctively Papal Rome to bless or help the cause of the Divine Prince of Peace on this occasion! But, on the other hand, some of the chief speakers, both in the Congress and the Conference, were men who acknowledge that the bellicose inconsistency of priests and professing Christians had tended to drive them into scepticism, or agnosticism It is a sadly suggestive fact that speakers, who candidly stated that they were not members of any Christian Church, constituted no inconsiderable proportion of the Delegates. Dr. Darby, the Secretary of the English, and Rev. R. B. Howard, the Secretary of the American Peace Society, courageously ventured to introduce a resolution into the Congress, which would have committed it to a solemn appeal, to all who bear the Christian name, to co-operate for the prevention of wars, on the special ground that, "the war spirit is essentially opposed to the precepts, example, and spirit of Christ." But the Congress, as a body, declined to adopt this proposal. And it is very interesting to observe that a Neapolitan journal, *Il Pungolo*, boldly expresses its approbation of the course of action taken by Dr. Darby and Mr. Howard. The Editor remarks:—"The motive which prompted that Resolution appeared to us, and still appears, to have been a most felicitous one. There, in front of the Vatican, which plots and awaits the spoils or booty of future wars, to be waged between fraternal peoples and by Temporal Powers, that appeal to a more Christian sentiment, raised in a Council of laymen, was a significant vindication of the Gospel from greedy monopoly and also a significant protest, on behalf of the grand, majestic and incomparably divine image of Christ." These words, in a popular newspaper at Naples, must be exceedingly gratifying and encouraging to many friends of Peace who earnestly desire and intend that the Christian basis of their principles and of their advocacy shall always be faithfully professed and resolutely maintained. This testimony, coming from such an unexpected quarter, also shows that fidelity to Christian principle cannot fail, at times, and finally, to extort homage from men of the world, or from those who make little or no special profession of religion. The English Peace Society, as represented by Dr. Darby, is heartily to be congratulated on the leading position which it took at the late Congress, on behalf of distinctively Christian principles.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE DIVINE LIBRARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT." By Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co.

IT may be commonplace, but it is none the less well to remind people that the value of a book is not to be estimated by its size. The volume before us only contains 155 pages of excellent type—Messrs. Macmillan's books are always well printed—but a great deal of information on matters concerning which people commonly called "educated" are often in total darkness is packed into them.

In clear language, and without any parade of needless learning, Professor Kirkpatrick tells us of the origin of the Old Testament; its divisions, and how it came into its present form; of the preservation of the Old Testament, of its inspiration, and of its use in the Church. Each one of these subjects, bristling though they are with controversial topics, he treats in a right temper and attitude; candidly, yet not overbearingly. Take for instance his remarks on what is somewhat arrogantly called Higher Criticism, and about which some are so very needlessly alarmed. He says, "It may indeed be asked whether the New Testament references do not at once decide many of these questions for the reverent believer, and preclude critical investigation. If the Pentateuch is referred to as the Law of Moses, or the latter chapters of Isaiah are quoted as the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, are we not bound to believe that the one was written by Moses, the other by Isaiah? If this position could be maintained, Christian criticism would be an anomaly and an impossibility. And there are some teachers who do not scruple to put before us the awful dilemma, you must choose between Christ and criticism. I call it an awful dilemma because, as it seems to me, it may amount to telling the student of the Old Testament that he must be false to his Divine Master, or false to the leading of the reason which God has given him—and that, not in mysteries which are outside the province of reason, but to matters where reason is perfectly capable of judging. The teachers who have presented us with this dilemma can scarcely have realised the strain to which it must subject the faith of

some of the younger generation. But I firmly believe that we are not forced to make the choice. It is not, I believe, contrary to the Catholic doctrine of our Lord's Person to suppose that in such matters His knowledge was the knowledge of His time. There can, it seems to me, be no impropriety or irreverence in such a view, when we are expressly told that He advanced in wisdom as well as in stature; and when in regard to at least one matter He Himself expressly declared that His knowledge was limited, when He said, 'of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father' (Mark xiii. 32). And this, although it was a matter of supreme importance, and intimately connected with the consummation of His own work. But apart from the deep and mysterious question of the limitation of our Lord's knowledge as man, it is difficult to see how He could (with reverence be it said) have done otherwise in literary matters than adopt the ordinary language of the time. He used, as we still use, popular and not scientifically accurate language with regard to national phenomena such as the rising and setting of the sun. And in like manner it is difficult to see how He could have avoided using the language of tradition with regard to the nomenclature of the books of the Old Testament. If this is true as regards our Lord, it will be true for the Evangelists and Apostles also." (page 8).

We venture to think that anybody who will fairly judge these remarks will come to the conclusion that very much less is at stake in the results of the "Higher Criticism" than is commonly thought, and that much of the heat gendered thereby is perfectly needless. It is possible to be in earnest, and yet quite calm in the matter. And when Professor Kirkpatrick applies these general remarks to particular cases, he shows that some, at any rate, of the results of the "Higher Criticism" are really in the end found to strengthen the best canons of biblical exegesis. For instance, the unity of the Book of Isaiah, he shows, is really harder to maintain than its duality. "It is conceivable" he says "that Isaiah might have been transferred in spirit to a future age, and taking his stand in the midst of tribulations which he foresaw were to come have predicted the deliverance which was to follow them, but such a hypothesis is not in accordance with the general economy of revelation. The more carefully we study the Old Testament, the more constantly are we impressed with what may be called the circumstantial origin of prophecy; with the fact that the teaching of one prophet after another arose directly out of the circumstances of his own time, and was providentially designed to meet the needs of that time. Adaptation is a law of Divine action in revelation as well as in nature. Here, on the other hand, if the prophecy were Isaiah's, we should have an example of a prophecy entirely disconnected from the events of the author's time, the practical value of which would not have been felt for at least a century after his death." This surely is clear to any thoughtful person, even though he may be ignorant of theological lore, or methods of prophetic interpretation.

We will confine ourselves to these two extracts; they are sufficient to show the "line" of the book; sufficient also, we hope, to recommend it to those who have not time to master larger and fuller treatises.

We may remark that we venture to think Professor Kirkpatrick somewhat underrates the value of the Septuagint text; on the other hand, we cordially agree with his dessent from Professor Cheyne's wild, not to say absurd, theories about the Psalter.

"THE CLOUD OF WITNESSES." A Daily Sequence of Great Thoughts from many Minds, following the Christian Seasons, by the Honourable Mrs. Lyttelton Gell. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse. Pp. 551. 1891.

THIS little book is peculiarly adapted for a gift book, being well bound and beautifully got up, with red edged leaves, and interspersed with red letters. It is divided into four parts, the First being, "Footprints of the Master," containing "The Season of Advent," "Christmas and the Dying Year," "The New Year and Season of Epiphany," "The Season of Lent," "Palm Sunday, Holy Week, Easter, Ascension, and Whitsuntide." On each of these subjects are quotations from great authors, forming portions for each day, many of them treasures of spiritual teaching. Some of the contributors are living, others have passed away. The Second Part contains "The Pilgrimage of the Disciple," "The Season of Trinity." The Third Part, "The Holy Communion." The Fourth Part "Epochs in the Christian Life." The quotations are chosen from above 200 authors. We have confidence in recommending this little volume to the notice of our readers, knowing that many would value it, and, we hope, find it helpful in daily life.

WE have had brought before our notice *The Sword and the Trowel*, price 3d., a monthly publication, edited by the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, containing some interesting papers, with one or two reviews of books, amongst others one on "The Prisons of the World," published by Morgan and Scott. Most of our readers will feel an interest in Mr. Spurgeon, with whom such universal sympathy has been expressed during his long and trying illness. His illustrated almanack for 1892, with a well-chosen text for each day in the year, we also commend to our readers. It is published in a convenient sized little book, price 1d.

"THE TREASURY" for January, 1892, contains as usual some very helpful and instructive articles and sermons. The sermon by Mr. Adams on "Elijah" is well worth reading, and is capable of being adapted to many a good address; but we particularly admire Dr. Wills' production, entitled "The Great Intercessor's New Year Petition." It is thoughtful, impressive, and at the same time is expressed in an attractive manner.

The *Treasury* may be congratulated on having in the current issue an article on "Sheol," which to our mind is most exhaustive, apart from the scholarly research displayed. We admire the simplicity, clearness, and conciseness of the explanation of the terms Gehenna, Hades, Hell, Rephaim, and Sheol. Again, we fail to appreciate the outlines for sermons; the outlines are too misty, and there is not that clearness and distinctness in the various heads and subdivisions which is essential to good sermon notes; in this respect the *Treasury* seems to us to have fallen short lately. The fault, however, is amply made up for in the able denunciation of what is commonly

called Higher Criticism, and in the article on the "Arts of Romanism," both of which are most interesting.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

RATIONAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE LIFE.

SIR,—I see in the PULPIT of 28th November that "Vicar" refers to Mr. Hocking's wish to "obtain rational conceptions of the life of the blessed ones," and adds his own wish to obtain "a conception of the life of the unblessed ones."

I think thoughts on those topics would be useful and beneficial, as I have often been astonished at the aspect of unreality which the utterances of good people presented to me.

I will only trespass on your time and space by remarking that our experience beyond the grave will not contradict the pious sentiments we cherished on earth. Those who resemble Christ now have tender compassion for those who suffer, and earnest desires, accompanied by efforts, that vice, crime, and evil of every kind may be removed. When they resemble Christ still more such sentiments and efforts must increase in intensity. Reflections of this kind throw some light on the life of the unblessed ones.

I trust that some of your able and earnest-minded contributors will enter on such questions. They certainly are more important than more than one recently treated in the PULPIT at great length.

J. B.

Canonbury, 1st February, 1892.

RECENT DECLARATION ON SCRIPTURE.

SIR,—There is a point respecting the declaration of the thirty-eight divines which has not within my observation received any attention. It is said in one paragraph that t he declarators accept our canonical Scriptures as divinely inspired; and in another paragragh that they accept them as a divine revelation. The authors proceed to say that they believe the absolute truth of all matters of fact, etc., in that divine revelation. There is, it appears to me, in these expressions a confusion of words (and of ideas, too) between inspiration and revelation. For myself, I believe that the writers of the Scriptures were inspired by God's Holy Spirit in their works; and I believe that those Scriptures contain a revelation, or many revelations, from God. But I believe also, that while the inspired writers of history derived their inspiration from God, they derived their facts in the ordinary way of men writing history. Indeed, one of the most important of these historians, that is St. Luke, opens his treatise with an assertion of his having investigated the correctness of the facts that he records. Even were this not so, the notion of such a thing as *revealed history* is very like a contradiction in terms; yet this is what, according to their language, the thirty-eight declarators appear to commit themselves to.

Were I addressing you at present only on the document that I speak of above, I would have some other remarks to make. I write you now on this, not so much on its own account as in the bearing that the above considerations have on a matter treated of by your correspondents recently. If thirty-eight prominent ministers of the church, several of them tolerably fair scholars, are capable of such looseness of thought and expression as I attribute to them, it is not surprising that others differ as to the meaning of a word. Yet the meaning of very few words is exact. It is not quite reasonable to treat the word *eternal* as if it, of all words, must have an exact unvarying meaning. There are other words and expressions in the Bible that no one construes with an absolute meaning. It would be hard to maintain that the kingdom of God means the same when our Lord tells his auditors that it is within them, and when He compares it to the seed of a mustard-tree. It would, again, be hard to find any person who interprets "take therefore no thought for the morrow" exactly. One of your correspondents suggests a derivation of *αἰώνιος* as determining its meaning. Whether the derivation given be correct or not, it settles no meaning; and a derivation does so in no language, Greek, English or other.

If I help you in closing a rather tiresome controversy I shall be glad.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

SAVING LIFE AT FUNERALS.

SIR,—If the first part of the Burial Service be said where the departed has been in the habit of worshipping, attendance can be limited to this part of the funeral ceremony, and all exposure to the cold avoided. Those who go to the grave can make use of a hood for the protection of the head, forehead, neck, and chest. This hood can be formed out of any scarf which is elastic, and long and broad enough. The scarf is first doubled and sewn together along one edge. The scarf so doubled is passed round the back of the neck with the seam upwards, and the two ends are folded and pinned together over the chest. The inner portion of the scarf touching the back of the neck is held tightly in its place while the outer portion is drawn over the head. Persons not using such a hood can raise their hats when the holy Name is used and at the close of each prayer, instead of remaining bareheaded the whole time.

Officiating ministers, in winter, and when the weather is inclement, can say the whole of the service in the church or cemetery chapel, except the words of committal and the grace. Cemetery authorities can provide an over-head canopy, borne on four or more poles, with tarpaulins on the weather side, for the protection of mourners from wind and rain on their way to the grave, such canopy being convertible into a tent, which can be roughly planked, at the grave-side.

F. LAWRENCE,
Hon. Sec. Funeral Reform Association.

Westow Vicarage, York, January 26th, 1892.

THE Bishop of Lichfield paid his first visit to St. Paul's, Burton-on-Trent, on Saturday, the 23rd ult., the occasion being the dedication of memorial windows in the side chapel. The service began at three in the afternoon, and consisted of the evensong of the First Prayer-book and a dedication service.

THE Rev. G. Ross has resigned the vicarage of Golant, Cornwall.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury reached Folkestone last Monday afternoon, and appeared to be in excellent health.

WE regret to learn that the income of the East London Church Fund for 1891 has fallen below the amount raised in the previous year.

THE Bishop of Lichfield was last Monday presented with an address of welcome from the clergy and laity of Stafford and the district, on the occasion of his first visit to the town.

AT Ely, on Thursday, the 28th ult., Dr. W. Cunningham, vicar of St. Mary-the-Great, Cambridge, was elected a Proctor in Convocation, to succeed Canon Slater, resigned.

THE Rev. John Wood, Vicar of Wolverton, and Rural Dean of Buckingham, is to be proposed as candidate for the Proctorship in Convocation, vacant by the death of Canon Freeling.

THE *Record* is authorised to state that there is no foundation for the statement, which we quoted from that paper, that the Rev. F. N. Eden, late of the Niger Mission, is about to join the staff of the S.P.G.

IT is now stated that the consecration of Archdeacon Straton to the bishopric of Sodor and Man is fixed for the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25th, in York Minster. The sermon will be preached by the Dean of Norwich.

THE installation of the Rev. T. Warren Trevor, M.A., rector of Machynlleth, to the prebendal stall of Penmynydd in Bangor Cathedral took place on the 26th ult. The ceremony was performed by the Dean. Canon Trevor has been appointed a surrogate by the Chancellor.

THE Bishop of London has fixed Tuesday and Wednesday, April 26th and 27th, for the session of the London Diocesan Conference. Subjects proposed for discussion must be notified to the hon. clerical secretary (Prebendary Thornton), to be laid before the committee. The latest day on which they can be received is April 4th; but members are requested to send them in as early as may be. The election of a new conference will be held shortly after the end of the session.

THE Bishop of Lichfield, in the *Diocesan Magazine*, expresses the obligation he has been under to Bishop Bromby for continuing to him till the end of 1891 the assistance which he had been previously rendering to his predecessor. "Although it is by an error that Bishop Bromby's name appears again as assistant-Bishop in the *Diocesan Calendar*, yet there is good reason to feel assured that his interest in the work of the diocese will not cease, nor his willingness to help, where and when he can."

THE Council of the Corporation of the Church House have appointed Mr. Sydney W. Flamank to be secretary, in the place of Mr. Percy Crosse, whose state of health, we regret to say, has compelled his resignation. We are requested to state that all letters to Mr. Crosse should be addressed to Court Lodge, Chipstead, Surrey, and not to the Church House. Mr. Crosse has been ordered abroad for a few weeks, but it is doubtful how soon he can go. We are sure that general regret will be felt that the unsatisfactory state of his health has necessitated Mr. Crosse's resignation as secretary of the Church House. It is mainly due to his zeal and energy that the Church House scheme has made the progress which the movement has attained, and the loss of his service at the present time will be severely felt.

CANON ROBESON was installed as Archdeacon of Bristol last Monday afternoon week at the cathedral. The institution was made by the Bishop, who announced beforehand to the numerous congregation that "he was about to institute to the office of Archdeacon in the archdeaconry of Bristol his friend and brother, Canon Robeson, in whose uprightness and rectitude he had the fullest confidence." After the institution the Dean assigned Archdeacon Robeson to a stall next the Bishop's throne.

A COMMISSION was held on Friday, the 29th ult., at the Town-hall, Buckingham, by order of the Bishop of Oxford, to inquire into the alleged misconduct of the Rev. William Thomas Wilson-Lang, rector of Thornton-with-Nash, Stony Stratford. The members of the commission were the Bishop of Reading, Mr. H. W. Cripps, Q.C., Chancellor of the diocese, Lord Cottesloe, and Lord Addington. The evidence, says the *Times*, went to show that the rector was addicted to drunkenness, and that on two occasions specified he was quite incapable of conducting the services. The Rector admitted that he was incapacitated, but said this was due, not to drink, but to deafness, shortness of sight, and a diseased knee. The Chancellor announced that the commissioners were unanimously of opinion that on the evidence there was a sufficient *primâ facie* case for further proceedings.

THERE appears to be a somewhat keen competition for the vicarage of Kirkdale, to which Convocation of Oxford University will present on February 11th. A statement which has been informally made—that if one of the two candidates is appointed a considerable sum of money will be given towards the building of a vicarage-house—has excited a good deal of indignation in some members of Convocation. The announcement was certainly ill timed; as the candidate, however, in question seems to have been selected and urged to stand not on grounds of personal favour, but as being a peculiarly suitable candidate for the place, perhaps the somewhat indiscreet zeal of his supporters will not prevent members of Convocation from fairly weighing his merits and qualifications. The number of livings to which Convocation has lately presented has been quite abnormal and exceptional; it is, however, only one of those accidents for which it is impossible to account.

THE opposition to the proposed statue to Cardinal Newman in Oxford seems to be gaining strength. There are many who, while they have little sympathy with the objections that have been raised on religious grounds, yet consider the scheme inopportune partly on the ground of the absence of any precedent for the erection of a statue in the streets of Oxford, partly because they hold that statues but little fit in with the *genius loci*, and ill suit so damp a climate as that in which we live. Those who remember the condition to which the Cæsars round the Ashmolean were reduced before they were renovated will be convinced that there is a good deal in this last argument; and if the statue is to be bronze and not stone, even so a plentiful application of soap and water seems to be a necessary

condition if it is to remain permanently a pleasing object to contemplate. People ask, too, whether a bronze statue is quite in keeping with the prevailing style of Oxford architecture. There seems, under these circumstances, a good deal to be said for the committee offering it to one of the colleges with which Newman was more intimately associated, all the more because the gift would seem to be likely to be acceptable to either of these societies.

AN exhibition of the remaining works of the late E. Goodwyn Lewis is about to be held at Mr. Stacey's "Royal Arcade Gallery," Old Bond Street, for the benefit of his widow and children. Mr Goodwyn Lewis was the painter of "The Last Supper," well known throughout the world wherever Church people are to be found. His last finished work in oil, "Christ and Nicodemus," will be exhibited here for the first time. It is a work as full of reverence and feeling as the beautiful "Man of Sorrows," delicately engraved in mezzotint by J. Scott, published in 1889. The scene represents the Master and him who "came unto Jesus by night," still engaged in conversation as the early dawn is breaking in the sky. The light just catches the hair of our Lord, giving it a touch of glory, whilst the disciple turns away, pondering in his mind the weighty words he has just heard, "How can these things be." Mr. Goodwyn Lewis travelled much in the East, and has succeeded in grasping, in a spirited manner, the familiar costumes and faces, and also in impregnating his water colour drawings with the atmosphere and local colour of the scenes represented. We feel sure that those of our readers who visit this exhibition will come away with a vivid sense of that land that witnessed the birth of our faith.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baldwyn-Childe, Rev. E. G., M.A.; Rector of Kyre Wyard, Tenbury.

Bouth, Rev. Reginald M.; Curate-in-Charge of the new district St. Stephen's, in the Parish of St. Michael and All Angels', Blackburn.

Briddon, Rev. W. H., M.A., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Hixon, Stafford.

Cruttwell, Rev. C. T., M.A., Rector of Kibworth and Smeeton Westerby; Rural Dean of Gartree Second Deanery.

Drought, Rev. W. J., the English Chaplain at Dusseldorf, Germany; Chaplain at Dunkerque, France.

Greenhill, Rev. Henry Joseph, M.A., Rector of Walton-on-Hill, Surrey; Chaplain to the Stationers' Company.

Hervey, Rev. Frederick Alfred John, M.A., Rector of Sandringham, Norfolk; Honorary Canon of Norwich Cathedral.

Horsburg, Rev. W., Perpetual Curate of Hayle; Rector of St. Enoder's, Cornwall.

Ingham, Rev. William, Curate of Whitby; Vicar of Old Malton, Yorkshire.

Jones, Rev. Richard, Curate of Menai Bridge; Rector of Bettwys-y-Coed.

Knapton, Rev. W. J.; Rector of St. Thomas's, Woolwich.

Long, Rev. Francis, M.A., late Curate of St. Margaret's, Dunham Massey, Bowdon; Curate-in-Charge of the Mission District at Ellesmere Port.

Malim, Rev. William Glinton, B.A., Vicar of St. Cuthbert-with-Holy Trinity, Thetford; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Marsh, Rev. Frederick T., late Curate of St. Anne's, Liverpool; Rector of North Piddel, near Worcester.

Martin, Rev. John, M.A.; Lecturer at Bromyard.

Maud, Rev. H. L., M.A.; Rector of Sanderstead, Surrey.

Milner, Rev. W. M. H., M.A., Assistant-Curate of St. Michael's, London-fields; Incumbent of Lockerbie, Dumfriesshire.

Mitchell, Rev. Henry, Rector of Loxbeare; Vicar of Stinsford, near Dorchester.

Morris, Rev. Charles Powell, B.A.; Chaplain of Shepton Mallet Prison.

Moxon, Rev. G. H., Chaplain at Dunkerque, France; Chaplain at Dusseldorf, Germany.

Nash, Rev. Ernest Henry, M.A.; Vicar of Wetley Rocks, Stoke-on-Trent.

Rooke, Rev. Henry, Rector of Wicklow; Honorary Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin.

Russell, Rev. H. V., M.A., Rector of Wem; Rural Dean of Wem.

Seager, Rev. John Lingen, M.A.; Vicar of Little Wymondley, Herts.

Sharrock, Rev. William Robert, M.A., Vicar of Ormsby, Middlesbrough; Vicar of Great Driffield, Yorkshire.

Thomas, Rev. Evan Benor, Curate-in-Charge of Heneglwys, Anglesey; Rector of Trawsfynydd.

Wade-Dalton, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Coverham-with-Horsehouse; Rector of Hauxwell, Yorkshire.

Ward, Rev. Earnest B., B.A.; Assistant-Missioner of the St. John's College (Cambridge) Mission, Walworth.

Wynne, Rev. Malcolm Bush; Rector of West Allington, Grantham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Andrews, Rev. Charles Gerrard, for twenty-six years Rector of the parish, at the Rectory, Wouldham, on the 23rd ult., aged 63.

Banister, Rev. William, of St. James's Mount, Liverpool, at Paignton, on the 20th ult., aged 76.

Burrows, Rev. Henry William, Canon at the Precincts, Rochester, on the 26th ult., aged 76.

Calvert, Rev. William Bainbridge, M.A., Rector of Mersey Hampton, Fairfold, Honorary Canon of Ripon, at the Rectory, Mersey Hampton, Fairfold, on the 28th ult., aged 71.

Dean, Rev. G. F., LL.M., Vicar of St. Paul's, Tranmere, on the 17th ult.

Dyson, Rev. William Henry, late Vicar of Sittingbourne, at 6, Carlton-road, Ealing, on the 29th ult., aged 61.

Ferguson, Rev. Thomas Pattinson, Rector of Shenfield, at Shenfield Rectory, on the 28th ult., aged 76.

Heard, Rev. James Nevill, Rector of the parish, at the Rectory, Caterham, on the 31st ult., aged 79.

Hurnall, Rev. John, many years Vicar of Eggington, at Leighton Lodge, Jersey, on the 27th ult., aged 89.

Hutton, Rev. Thomas, for thirty-two years Rector of the parish, at Stilton, Hunts, on the 29th ult., aged 76.

James, Rev. Benjamin Fuller, for thirty-eight years Assistant Master at Westminster School, at 6, Hungersall Park, Tunbridge Wells, on the 29th ult., aged 67.

Johnston, Rev. Henry Cromwell, Chaplain of Kensal-green Cemetery, at 163, Ladbroke-grove-road, on the 24th ult., aged 57.

Laing, Rev. Malcolm Strickland, late Chaplain on the Bengal Establishment, at the Vicarage, Hinton St. Mary, Dorset, on the 24th ult., aged 62.

Mapleton, Very Rev. Reginald John, Dean of Argyll and the Isles, at Duntroon Castle, Lochgilphead, Argyllshire, on the 30th ult., aged 74.

Marlande, Rev. John, Vicar of Ventnor, Isle of Wight, on the 30th ult., aged 64.

Read, Rev. Thomas Frederick Rudston, Rector of the parish, at Withyham Rectory, on the 29th ult., aged 90.

Rowlatt, Rev. John Henry, at Holloway, on the 26th ult., aged 88.

Smith, Rev. Charles Septimus, Curate of St. Mary's, Lower Ince, Wigan, on the 23rd ult., aged 40.

Smyth-Pigott, Rev. George Octavius, S.C.L., Exeter College, Oxon, for nearly forty years Rector of the parish, at Kingston Seymour Rectory, Somerset, on the 24th ult., aged 65.

Taylor, Rev. William Thomas, for eight years Curate and twenty-three years Vicar of the parish, at the Vicarage, Oldbury, Birmingham, on the 21st ult., aged 57.

Tweed, Rev. Henry Wilson, for thirty-three years Vicar of the parish, at Bristowe Vicarage, Ross, on the 27th ult., aged 67.

The Church of England Pulpit.

TRUE FREEDOM IN THE CHURCH.

By the Rev. W. J. KNOX-LITTLE, M.A., Canon of Worcester.

Sermon Preached in the Chapel Royal, Savoy, W.C., on Sunday, March 8th, 1891.

"Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."—Gal. iv. 26.

BY an old tradition of the English Church this Sunday is called "Mothering Sunday." I suppose the solemn and severe ideas of Lent which, after all, live amongst us, although the more ascetic and determined expressions of those ideas have quite necessarily and naturally passed away—although it be quite true that, in consequence of climate, in consequence of time, in consequence of the change of circumstance, Lent is not quite to all of us what once Lent was to the Christian Church, yet there still remains on the minds of the Christian Church the serious thought of those who think that their Prayer-book is something more than a mere book of antiquarian research, who really believe that it has a guiding power, there still remains the thought that Lent has a solemn and severe and tremendous teaching; that, if it does nothing else, if it does not lay down strict lines of exact discipline, if it does not lay down certain statements of an exact amount of ascetic fasting, it yet reminds us that to be good men and true men discipline is necessary for the Christian life. And when we come to a Sunday with that old English name of "Mothering Sunday," we are reminded—are we not?—that all discipline and all severity, that all self-conquest and all self-government, that all that implies putting the hand strongly and sternly upon the rein, is not a mere bit of absurd and pretentious ecclesiasticism, but that it does lead us to that which the wise man says is the truth, that "discipline has the care of love," that it does lead us at last to rest.

My brothers and sisters, if I have the great privilege, through him who ministers to you here, of being allowed to speak to you just this once and no more, can I do better, on a day that the old English Church calls "Mothering Sunday," than to remind you of some thoughts of encouragement?—how, if indeed you realise the dignity and the greatness of discipline, you may remember that it leads to your rest. For, after all, is it not quite true of every human being amongst us, that we do feel the stress and strain of daily life? Is it not true, at once of the preacher and those who are preached to, at once of the worker and those who are supposed to have leisure, that the world in our time is a very busy world, and what we want, and what we long for, if we are to go down to the depth of hearts, and if we are to say the straight and honest thing, is something like rest? And if I can say one word to encourage and remind you that there remaineth, really and truly, and not in sentiment and imagination, and not in sentimentality—that there remaineth a rest for those who love what is right and good, then there is a message from Mothering Sunday that may help you, my brothers and sisters—that is all I want—that may help you to bear the toils of your pilgrimage and to do your duty.

Now, St. Paul, I submit, had some thought like that upon his mind when he wrote the great words of the text. Of course I do not deny for a moment that St. Paul had also a very serious ecclesiastical and theological argument in his brain. He had got two great lines of comparison, and he was comparing one with the other; but about that I have nothing to say to-day. Deeper down than those lines of comparison was the one great thought, the governing thought, the thought that was lying deep in the big strong heart of that strong great man, the thought that, after all, his theological teaching, and all his ecclesiastical struggle, and all his theological argument, must lead—if it lead to anything worth the consideration of human beings—must lead to the rest of the human being in soul and heart and mind and everything. That great thought governed all; and with that great thought before him, he took a sort of image, he took a sort of picture, he took something that he had himself seen and known and felt and loved. He named what to him was a great name,—he named Jerusalem. "Jerusalem," he said, "the Jerusalem above is free, which is the mother of us all."

Well, now, first, I think that we may well remember to-day that, when St. Paul said such words as these, if he spoke of the city of Jerusalem he spoke of a fact which had very special characteristics. There is no doubt that the great city of Jerusalem has been, and in fact is, a fact that attracts the interest of thoughtful men. To the pious Jew, of course, it was a fact that spoke of a certain amount of real, absolute natural beauty. There lay the city. I remember one night some Englishmen riding quite suddenly round the city, and entering it by a gate they had not expected, from circumstances over which they had no control, and coming, under the full moon, in full sight of the city, even under Turkish rule, and seeing not the pinnacles of the Temple, but the shining minarets, all that represents a false and degraded religion,—I remember those men coming suddenly in sight of the city in the moonlight and

reining up their horses; and one of them—a very good man, a very holy man, a very strong man—at the first sight of Jerusalem burst into tears; and then afterwards, when he conquered himself, he said, "It is like one's first communion, it is like for the first time taking the sacrament." Under the soft moonlight it might be the Temple, it might have all the magnificence of the palace of Zion, it might be all that one has read of since one was a child in the nursery. Here it is, in its strange and splendid position, wonderfully beautiful. Hemmed in at least on two sides by a great valley, governed—at least it was in St. Paul's days—on the other sides by great fortifications, it represented extraordinary beauty, a beauty of a great city with a platform of its own, with hills running round it, not so high as to forbid human effort, not so low as to keep down human aspiration, but high enough and low enough to call human minds to high thoughts about so great a thing as that city. And when a pious Jew—and if ever there was a pious Jew, with a great big heart, it was St. Paul—named Jerusalem, he named a city of extraordinary beauty and extraordinary situation.

And then, dear friends, we do not waste our time if we remember this: when St. Paul named Jerusalem he named something that represented a very great and a very magnificent tradition. I submit that there are two thoughts that ought to govern men's minds with very great power whenever men's minds are lifted to the highest things. The one is a national joy, and the other a religious enthusiasm. No doubt it has become the fashion in modern days to be so cosmopolitan that you are called by names which I will not name in this pulpit if you have a great enthusiasm for national life. But, none the less, after all, national life means the expression of the highest and best thoughts of a great race in one direction as God may guide it, and no man that is ever worth the name of man but has felt his pulse beat quicker and his heart fly faster when he has thought of the great things that his nation has done before him, or may do perhaps when he is gone. But there is something even higher than national joy—there is religious enthusiasm. To have a real enthusiasm for lifting men up to higher thoughts, to feel that you may enable them to love and think of the very best things, that you may be a strength and support to them in their great struggle and trial, to live not for what is base or bad or low or degrading, but what may last beyond the grave,—to think of that on a large scale, to think that that may be represented by a great Church, to think that goodness and truth and duty may have a corporate existence—surely that is great! And there was a time—it requires an effort of imagination, I grant it, to think of it—there was a time when national joy and religious enthusiasm went together, and that was the joy of a pious Jew. Alas! alas! in our times we have come to the days when we have to think of national life as one thing and religious enthusiasm as another, when we have to remember that national life means a whole system, very often of chicanery and trickery and political pantomime, and God knows what—very often a great deal that is good and great and strong and real; when we have to make up our minds, for better or for worse, that the State is one thing and the Church is another—so much the worse for humanity. But in the time when St. Paul lived—at least, in the time of the early pious Jews whose traditions he represented—Jerusalem meant something that spoke of national joy and religious enthusiasm joined together. Is it any wonder that he spoke of it with a very great, a tremendous delight?

And then remember this. Jerusalem meant for St. Paul, as he spoke of it as a fact, not only a beautiful and a wonderful place, not only the representative of national and religious enthusiasm and joy, but it also meant something most unusual. It meant a place which had associations about it that changed life. Dear friends, perhaps you will allow me to remind you here that not so very long ago in London there was one sweet voice coming from one sweet mind—the sweetest voice, the clearest mind that I personally have ever known: a voice that used to say to me, a mind that used to express to me, one thought that I would like to express to you to-day. That mind used to feel, and that voice used to express, "Don't forget, whatever you are doing in mortal life, that things are not measured by their appearances, but that association goes three-fourths of the way in governing life." Dr. Liddon—the power of whose voice, the sweetness and clearness and perfection of whose mind, I hope London, which I always think hardly understood him, may yet feel, now that they want him—used constantly to be expressing that thought in private conversation. "There are places," he used to say, "that are powerful by association, there are forces which seem small in themselves, but if you take their vital power because of all the forces of vitality around them, you find how they tell upon your own life." That was a favourite thought of his, pressed home to his friends in private conversation, and, I doubt not,—though I never had the chance of listening to him,—pressed home to great congregations in St. Paul's. Now that thought, often brought home to me in private conversation by that great and astonishing man, reminds me of what St. Paul really must have meant by his first thought about Jerusalem. A place unusual, very small, very very tiny compared with modern thoughts, but, oh, with what association! I suppose you and I have gone through the streets of London, my brothers and sisters, without any very great palpitation of heart, or any very strong feeling, excepting endurance or suffering or duty; but I suppose there have been moments when we have stood by the seaside, when we have

stood on the crag, when we have walked waist-deep in the heather, when we have gathered flowers in the garden, when we have gone into the woods swept by the winter wind, when we have plucked some little plant growing up in the early spring-time, when we have listened to the surging waves of the surging sea—there has been nothing about us that has moved mankind at large, but we have felt like the great English poet felt when he opened the book and found his daisy, we have felt that in that world, in that surging sea, in that rising flower, in that blowing breeze, in that gust across the cliff, there has been a memory, there has been the thought of the one little hand that was dearer than all, there has been a recollection of the child that we loved like our own soul—now separated from us by seas and continents. There has been, in fact, the power of association, and that one strong thing that ever moved a human heart,—there has been love surrounding a human object, and that object did not depend for its magnificence upon its physical size, but depended upon its power of drawing out of the heart the great forces that belong to the heart, and what Liddon used to say to me long ago comes true: "Depend upon it, dear friend, it is not the size of things that does the work, it is the force of love within the thing." Jerusalem!—Jerusalem to St. Paul and to the pious Jew meant something that represented the awful love of eternity, the power of national feeling and religious life. St. Paul spoke of a fact

My brothers and sisters, St. Paul certainly spoke of a fact; but I want to commend to your intelligence this thought,—he spoke also of a symbol, a symbol which the Apostle felt as much as you and I can feel; and yet remember you and I can feel it as much as the Apostle felt. Jerusalem, as St. Paul spoke of it—Jerusalem as the Bible speaks—reminded him, reminds us, of the Christian Church in her struggle. For, mark, there was one thing about Jerusalem as the Apostle thought of it,—beautiful, strange, associated with great ideas,—she suffered—suffered first from this invasion and then from that; there was one thing about her when the Apostle wrote that marked her as miserable,—she was not free. Now, Jerusalem is the great representative of the Christian Church, and the Christian Church is the great association of souls bound in Jesus Christ, living for eternity, living above the world, feeding on supernatural grace, looking at eternal beauty, raised by high associations, struggling with difficulty. Mark, if you and I are to learn the lesson from Jerusalem to-day, we have to remember that we are citizens of that Church; and what is the consequence? My brothers, we belong to a city, we English Churchmen, extremely beautiful. Certainly there is a greatness about that part of the Catholic Church to which you and I belong, which we would be most treacherous to forget, a greatness that touches national life, a greatness that leaves us free to say our prayers in our own dear language, a greatness that enables us to speak the truth and do our duty, and go our way and suffer our suffering. Certainly there is a greatness and beauty about our Jerusalem that we ought not to forget, and I do not think that any Englishman ought to forget that, amongst the great gifts of the heritage that he has got from his national life, there is none greater than being a member of the English Church. True sacraments, a true priesthood, the Word of God, prayer in its own vernacular, and yet that freedom and sweet air that comes from honesty and truth and duty,—that we love, and I hope that we shall always love, as English people. And yet, dear friends, let us pause for a moment,—and oh! whatever we do, let us face the fact, let us remember that our Jerusalem is not quite free. I may repeat myself to you this morning, and say a great conviction of my soul: there is a corrupt tendency in every heart,—I appeal to your hearts: is it not true?—there is a corrupt tendency in every heart that tends to fix that heart upon some object of sense, it tends to make that object something instead of God, and it reacts upon the source from which it comes, and it blocks the way to God. Multiply that by a hundred thousand million souls, and you find a hundred thousand million men and women with their corrupt tendency, with the object of life put before them instead of God, with the reactionary force of that upon themselves, and then you not only find a large multitude who are not living for God, dear brothers and sisters, you find more I submit, you find a great tradition, you find it handed on from age to age, a temper, a tone, an atmosphere, of taking things as if they were God, and putting them in place of God. It is handed on from man to man, from father to child, it grows like the London fog, it grows like the smoke from the chimneys, and you and I, when we wake in the morning,—small blame to us!—we find it hard to breathe, and we find our eyes are sore, and we ask ourselves why it is so hard to be good and dutiful; and the answer of the Bible is plain—the world as conceived by St. John; and I hold it unfair to say that that belongs to high life, although high-born people are especially its victims; I hold it untrue to say that that belongs to politicians or commercial people, although commercial people and politicians are in special temptation; I hold it is false for theologians to pretend that the world is only in the West End drawing-room, or only in the political pantomime of the House of Commons, or only in the commercial pantomime of the City. No, dear friends, that atmosphere is in us all—in the clergyman, in the layman, in the poor person, in the cottage, everywhere and always—the great tradition of evil. But what does it do? It holds our Jerusalem, it makes the clergyman a place-hunter instead of speaking the truth, it makes the layman a worldling and neglectful of his church, it

makes the young girl look for some good *parti* in life instead of marrying the man she loves, it makes the father and mother do "the proper thing" for their child instead of thinking of their souls, it makes you, it makes me, play a pantomime and neglect our duty; and when you come to public life, it makes those who govern and guide the Church not guide it by principle or govern it by Divine revelation, but think about what will tell and what will pay. Ah! my friends, it is a real power, and the Apostle felt it, and you and I feel it every day, and we are hypocrites and pretenders if we say we do not feel it; for we feel it in our private prayers, and we feel it in our public duties, and we feel it as we take account of our consciences. There is a power that is opposiug Jerusalem, like Nebuchadnezzar; the Church of God is face to face with the world, and the world is putting her in shackles, and we have to live in the Church, and our eternity depends upon whether rightly, and truly, and sincerely, and honestly, and simply, and straightforwardly we are quite determined, come what may, we shall think of God's principles and not of the world's teaching.

We shall remember not only that the symbol of Jerusalem is the Church in her slavery, but we shall lift our eyes above the darkness, and our lungs above the fog, and we shall remember the last truth which comes to us to-day—that the Apostle not only spoke of a fact or of a symbol, he spoke a prophecy, and a prophecy which will come to pass. Dear friends, that is my message of consolation to you. Take heart of grace, and do not be frightened: it will come. Jerusalem which is above is not like the fact bound by Egypt and Nebuchadnezzar, not like the symbol bound by the world—Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all; for after all, dear friends, it is not sentimentality, it is not imagination, it is not a mere dream. After all, your consciences respond to it; after all, your intelligences answer to it; after all, your hearts rise up to it; after all, you are born for better things than this passing pantomime; after all, if you and I have the strength of principle, and the warmth of heart, and the sturdiness of consistency, and the quietness of duty, and the sweetness of temper, and the force of prayer,—after all there is a Jerusalem above which is free, and she is the mother of us all.

Free! Why free? I make no doubt that when I speak to English people, and I use the word free, I touch a nerve that vibrates swiftly; for any honest English heart understands the meaning of liberty. You are bound by error, you and I—we make mistakes; you are bound by sense, you and I—we are tempted by the body; you are bound by the world, you and I—we are attracted or persecuted or ridiculed. The world has taken good care to do her work in the Church; she attracts the Church into playing the part of a worldling, she ridicules the Church lest you should think religion too serious, and then she persecutes the Church as they persecuted in the Inquisition, as Calvin, among the Nonconformists, burnt Servetus. The world goes everywhere,—yes, do not let us forget it, do not let us pretend to stand outside other people, do not let us get on stilts and think we are above everybody else. Not a bit of it. We are subjected to the great temptation, to the temptation not to be true, not to be loving, not to go straight.

Now think, there comes the time, my brothers and sisters,—and this is our great consolation,—there comes the time, so the Apostle says, when Jerusalem which is above shall be free. First, I would remind you,—and perhaps it will help you in the struggles of your difficulty and your darkness which you and I have to go through,—it will be free by truth. There will come the time when truth will be quite clear, when there will be no mistake, when there will be no misunderstanding. Perhaps you may find a difficulty, not about truth, but about love: there will come a time in the Church when there will be no more hardness or cruelty or scorn, but there will be real affection, there will be love. Jerusalem which is above will be free by truth, and she will be free by love.

And then, if in one word I am to borrow the words of a great Apostle, there will come the time—and by faith we have to cling to it—when "there will be no night there." "I beheld," said the Apostle who lay on the breast of Jesus, "the Holy City, the new Jerusalem, coming out of heaven from God." "I beheld her," he said; and he describes her position, her place, and her gates, but he ends it up by saying, "There will be no night there,"—there will be no misunderstanding, there will be no want of clear light, there will be no temptation to sensual sin, there will be no darkness in conscience, there will be no failure of real affection. Take courage; if you are trying to live by principle, if you are trying to do your duty, if you are trying to say your prayers, if you are trying to take the sacraments, take courage, and remember a moment is coming, and it is coming quickly, when there will be no night there. I know it is exceedingly difficult to persuade people of that, because the world has eaten into the Church; but this I say, in closing, "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." If you are a victim of the world, if you are a victim of lust, if you are a victim of opinion, you are bound and tied. There are two ways out it it: the one—there may be those before me who find that way, but I do not think that there are many—the one is Innocence. There are those who are innocent from the great offence. If there be one that I speak to who is innocent from the great offence, "Keep innocency, and do the thing that is right, for that shall bring a man peace at the last." But the other way, my brother and sister, is nearest to us,—Penitence. Most of us have done wrong, and

there is one way out of the wrongdoing, and that is sorrow, and sorrow is the path of freedom. If you have gone wrong, if you have left the Jerusalem above, come back by sorrow to the mother that bóre you. Don't be a fool, and think that the world with its cynical scorn and foolish laugh can put aside eternal truth. Ye are the children of the Church of Jesus if, having done wrong, ye are sorry. Come back; ye belong to the Jerusalem above, "which is the mother of us all."

And then this last thought. I may fail to persuade you of the danger and the difficulty of the Church on earth, I may fail to persuade you of the principles by which that Church has to work for the Church in heaven; but there is one thing I am quite certain of, and I want you to think of it as I close to-day. Those who desire to do right, those who desire to serve God, remember that right and truth and duty are freedom; remember that all persuasions of sin and worldliness are persuasions to slavery; remember that here and now you and I may be attracted by what is wrong; but attraction is not conviction, and wrongdoing is ever leading to the bond of slavery that will bind us down. Remember—oh, remember!—that whatever comes, whatever goes, certainly you will die.

"Sunset, and even-star,
And one clear call for me,
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea;

"But such a tide as, moving, seems asleep,
Too full for wave or foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep,
Turns again home.

"Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark,
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark.

"For though from out this bourne of time and sense
The tide may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face,
When I have crossed the bar."

My brothers and sisters, the central figure in the New Jerusalem is Jesus Christ—"the Way, the Truth, and the Life," and all sin and all sorrow may be laid at His feet, and may be placed in His heart; and those who are honest and thorough, and seek His life and His assistance, they, and they only, will find freedom from the world and the flesh and the devil, which brings us at last eternal rest.

Thank you for bearing with me while I have put before you my view of the New Jerusalem for the Church of God in eternity, for which you and I are preparing. Now, the Jerusalem which is above us is free. My brother, my sister, if we live according to her principles, she is free, and she is the mother of us all.

THE headquarters of the Church Lads' Brigade have now been removed to the Church House.

"FOR THEY REST FROM THEIR LABOURS."

BY THE REV. JOHN PENFOLD.

SERMON ON THE LATE SIR MORELL MACKENZIE, K.C.B., M.D., PREACHED IN ST. JAMES' CHURCH, MARYLEBONE.

WE have been speaking this morning of the deep need of humanity for sympathy and love—our thoughts fly back to the loyal, loving character of the true friend of many of us, who now lies dead, Sir Morell Mackenzie. We have lost more in him than the man unrivalled in science, and brilliant in letters. We have lost a man who was good as well as great, loving and true, as he was noble and generous. He was conspicuous for his ready and tender sympathy and his courteous considerateness, no service was too great, and, still rarer quality, none was too small for him to render it like a leal gentleman, freely and gladly. One illustration will paint his character more clearly than many words. Long ago I, a rough schoolboy, had to see Sir Morell Mackenzie; the ordeal of waiting in the crowd (though he worked all day long people had sometimes to wait for days without seeing him) was very terrifying to a shy boy who had never been in London before, and Sir Morell knew it, he was always quick at the heart's language, and gave orders that I was to be shown into an empty room and brought to him immediately he was free. It was a small kindness, so small that I suppose he had forgotten all about it the next day, but what a tenderness of heart it showed; under a stress of work which might have made him forget more important things, he was able to remember even the humours of an awkward child; but in his large heart there was room for everyone. Such was the man who has died, in the zenith of his fame, when many years of usefulness seemed before him. What his loss means to multitudes whose happiness and health, and even life depended on his unfailing skill, we dare not even guess; to those who knew and loved him it is irreparable, almost beyond the reach of consolation. If I held the crude belief that God deliberately ordered these awful shocks I should indeed be inconsolable. I should altogether fail to see in the affairs of men the hand of an all-caring Providence. But I do not believe it. Τοῦς γὰρ εὐσεβεις θέοι θνησκούντας οὐ χαιρουσίν. God does not order a good man's death. I see in these affairs the plain result of human will and action through which the Divine purpose is gradually, with delays and checks, accomplished. Sir Morell has died because, like one of the heroes, he chose death rather than life; he worked as few men work, and drew deliberately upon the capital of life, till, when the crisis came, there was no reserve of strength left to meet it. Why did he work? For wealth? he had it already in abundance. For fame? he had

that too, enough, and more than enough; he had for years stood upon that eminence which too easily becomes a mark for envy and injustice. For honours? he had refused more distinctions than most men can ever hope to win. He might long since have withdrawn from active work into dignified and leisured ease, to gratify the cultured tastes which distinguished him in the society of which he was one of the brightest ornaments. He worked on for the sake of other people, for the advantage of men and women to whom his unremitting toil was the condition of healthy existence. And now his rest has come, but, while we deplore the loss of a friend, we are glad to honour the memory of a hero.

For here, my sorrowing friends, amid the lowest tones of grief we strike the deep note of consolation. It is a noble thing that a man should die when he might have lived for the sake of the life of others. It is impossible to contemplate this great renunciation without being stirred in ourselves to higher things, the death of a dear friend fans into flame the embers of high emotions which might never have been kindled by his life. When a great man is dead the far perspective of the other world brings the lines of his character into just proportion. Close under the minster wall our eyes are blinded to the master's great design; as the distance grows, the work shapes itself out into all its glory. While the great man lived his fame was somewhat dimmed, jealous rivals sought to foul it, malignant scribes detracted from it, foes were constant, and friends were often false.

"*Virtutem incolumem odimus; sublatam exoculis quærimus invidi.*"

It is too true. We do not always care to love the highest when we see it—at all events we cannot fully appreciate it. Only when it is gone we would have it back—alas! we cannot see it, we cry for it, we stretch out our hands seeking for it. "*Quærimus, invidi.*"

"I heard a voice from heaven, saying, from henceforth blessed are the dead which die in the Lord. Yea, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours." I notice that labour is the condition of rest; if you want to die in the Lord you must first live in the Lord, live doing His work, and die doing it. Such a life and such a death were our dead dear friend's. God grant us the same grace, like him live working, and die working, die in harness if you want to die in the Lord.

In future the Archbishop of York will hold ordinations at the four Ember seasons in each year; at Lent and in September for deacons only, and at Trinity and Advent for priests. The examinations will be held a few weeks previously, and a course of devotional reading will be prescribed for the interval before ordination. The examination for deacons for the Lent ordination begins on Monday next. Candidates should be at Bishopthorpe by 4 p.m.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1892.

SIR MORELL MACKENZIE.

THE lamented death of Sir Morell Mackenzie has terribly shocked society, not only because it was premature and attended by circumstances of almost tragic suddenness, but because of the blow to human confidence. One more note of emphasis has been added to the long moral of the ultimate futility of unequalled powers and the inevitable limitations of the most exalted genius. There are thousands, literally thousands, who owe their lives to the unrivalled skill and science of the great man who has gone to the grave, it may almost be said, instead of them. For there can be no doubt that Sir Morell Mackenzie, like one still nobler, willingly spent himself, and was spent for the good of others. Like a champion of old time he had fought and won the battle with death so often on behalf of his friends that he was tired and weary, and then, in his hour of weakness, the grim king tilted at him on his own account, and the good knight went down.

Sir Morell's death will leave a great gap in many lives, a gap which can never be filled; there was never a man more well-beloved. With his rare gifts of science he combined a host of qualities which won him esteem and affection in an unusually wide circle of friends. In town and country, in cottage and palace, he was equally loved and trusted, his sympathy never failed, his fine tact and stately courtesy were never wanting, he was chronically overworked, he was often sorely tried and hardly tried, but no personal considerations ever interfered with his genial kindliness and unwearying devotion.

Sir Morell Mackenzie can have no successor. No doubt as the march of science continues on

other men will rise up who will equal and surpass even his great attainments. It is less likely that, like him, they will combine with profound knowledge the most consummate manual skill and adroitness; certainly we shall not see it in our generation. These conditions made the great specialist. But Sir Morell's genius was a gem of many facets and flashed back every ray of light that struck it. That we may hardly hope to see again. It is difficult to say in what walk of life he would not have attained pre-eminence and what position he would not have adorned. He was brilliant in art, in letters and in scholarship, and withal in the noblest qualities of head and heart which rank a man high in the affairs of friendship and hospitality. He was a knight-errant of these latter days, bearing the bright shield of unsullied chivalry to both friends and foes; he shrank from no contest, and he was a terrible antagonist, unmatched in fence and unbeaten in controversy. But he was ever loftier than his opponents, in character as in skill, and the memory of his triumph is lost in the memory of his goodness.

"Here—here's his place, where meteors shoot, clouds form,
Lightnings are loosened,
Stars come and go! let joy break with the storm,
Peace let the dew send!
Lofty designs must close in like effects:
Loftily lying
Leave him—still loftier than the world suspects,
Living and dying."

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE EVIDENCES.

By ARTHUR J. MELHUISH, F.R.A.S.

The Foundation of our Faith.

"If Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." So wrote the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and Christians and unbelievers alike admit its truth. But it follows that if Christ did rise from the dead, then is our faith not vain, then is the Christian revelation true, and a matter of supreme importance to us all. The evidences in support of this fundamental fact far exceed the proofs of any other historical event, and it is only reasonable to expect that they should. Moreover these "many infallible proofs" are supported by such numberless other proofs as to render it absolutely impossible that somehow or other, though we might not see how, some hideous mistake has been made. It may be said of all human testimony, founded on personal observation, that the witnesses are either liars, or fools, or that their testimony is true. This is a simple method of judging of the value of human testimony, and as true as it is simple. Thus, Christ and His Apostles were either impostors, or foolish enthusiasts, or their record is true. But the resurrection of Christ has an additional proof which no other historical fact has. That the Apostles and their Master were impostors has long since been given up as untenable, so the only other refuge that now remains for the unbeliever is that they were wild enthusiasts; but not only do the character of Christ, and the writings of His Apostles, make such a supposition absurd, but, apart from that, *what became of the body?* For if the Apostles were mistaken fools, they believed that their Lord had risen, but unless they were also absolutely mad, the fact of the dead body being still in the tomb must at once have cured their folly. Now every Christian writing extant, as well as all the attacks of their opponents, from the days of the Apostles, refer to the resurrection of Christ as the foundation of the Christian Faith. But if the Apostles were such mad fools as to believe that their Master had risen from the dead whilst His dead body was before them, *is it possible* that their writings, founded on such a miserable and stupid lie, could be what they are, that the whole religious system of crazy fools could be such as to commend itself, in all succeeding ages, to the wisest and best of men, as a revelation worthy of God Himself! Did ever a rotten tree bear such goodly fruit!

Gamaliel, that great doctor of the law, wisely said to the great Jewish Council, in reference to the first preachers of our faith, "Let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of men it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it," and never were inspired words more true. Has it been overthrown? For nearly nineteen centuries the attempts of unbelievers to do so have been unceasing, and what have they accomplished? Nothing, less than nothing. Celsus thought to do it, but who cares a jot for his arguments now. The learned Porphyry thought to do it, but who heeds his objections now, whilst their admissions have become important links in the chain of Christian evidences. Hume thought he had done it, but who regards his learned sophistries now. Tom Pain was sure he had done it, he had "plucked up the last tree from the Christian Garden of Eden," but who would own himself a follower of that ribald blasphemer now.

The very objections against Christianity show, by their miserable nothingness, alike the animus and weakness of their authors. The prophecies of Isaiah are corroborative proofs of such force, that every possible effort has been, and is being, made by unbelievers and pretended believers to weaken them, but so long as they admit, as they are compelled to admit, that the 53rd chapter of Isaiah was written long before the Christian era, they may spare their pains.

If Gamaliel could have looked forward to these days, and have seen how that on every resurrection day, shops are closed, and churches opened, throughout the civilised world, in remembrance of that event; could he have foreseen that eighteen centuries hence millions of the best and wisest of men would love and worship the once despised Galilean, would not he too have believed! And what did a greater than Gamaliel say of the kingdom which he came to set up on earth: "The Kingdom of Heaven is like a grain of mustard seed, which indeed is less than all seeds, but when it is grown is greater than the herbs, and becometh a tree." Was there ever a more unlikely prophecy! Has that kingdom, then so despised and insignificant, "come to nought," does it show any signs of coming to nought, or has the prophecy been fulfilled? The bitterest enemy of our faith must admit that it has. Then what are his poor pointless objections worth when set in opposition to this one fact, and one only, of a hundred similar ones all pointing the same way.

The records of our faith comprise writings spread over more than a thousand years, the works of

prophets, priests, and kings, of peasants and fishermen, and there cannot but be some difficulties and objections, which only perfect knowledge can perfectly explain. A plausible and oft repeated objection is, that if the Christian revelation were from God, He would have written it on the skies, but all that this amounts to is, that if the objector had had the management of it, he would have so arranged it; but God has not chosen to force the truth upon us in that manner. He gives us our choice. If we desire to know Him, He has given us sufficient evidence to convince us beyond a doubt that He has spoken to us by His Son, but if we love darkness rather than light, we may have what we prefer. It is so in every path of life, there is scarcely any folly that a man cannot believe, if he be so inclined, for in all matters, not purely intellectual, we believe more from sympathy than from evidence, but all such objections are met and nullified by the axiom in logic, that "objections are of no weight against demonstration," and of the fact that Christ rose from the dead, we have such complete demonstration, that to doubt that, we must doubt that Julius Cæsar ever lived, or that William the Norman ever reigned, for the evidences in proof of these facts are as nothing compared to the proofs that Christ lived and died and rose again.

> Whence but from Heaven did men unskilled in arts,
> At different ages born, in different parts,
> Weave such agrēeing truths, or how or why
> Should all conspire to cheat us with a lie?
> Unasked their pains, unwelcome their advice,
> Starving their gains, and martyrdom their price.

WILLIAM REEVES, LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

The "Prayer Book" Churchman.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, D.D.,
Rector of Warrenpoint.

The name of William Reeves even in the distant future will, without doubt, recall the memory of a profound scholar, a conscientious bishop, a learned archæologist, and an Irish Churchman who, throughout the trying scenes that followed Disestablishment, acted the part of a man loyal to the spirit and the traditions of the ancient church of St. Patrick, whilst careful to recognise that altered circumstances involved the necessity for an altered constitution and would lead to a new system of administration in the Church of the future. But to those who knew the man the influence of his personality cannot perish. They must perforce think of him as *a presence*, not as *a memory*, as one whom to know even at a distance was to revere, whom to know more intimately was to have that reverence intensified, but at the same time deepened into love. Some hand more skilful than mine will write the memorials of his useful ministry, but none more reverent, none more loving, can add a spray to the wreath thus laid upon his tomb. I can recall my first meeting with him some sixteen or seventeen years ago, and our pleasant stroll through the quiet Dartrey woods. One who did not know him might have found some difficulty in realising that the quiet unobtrusive parson, full of genial anecdote, was one of the most learned of Irish divines, without an equal as an antiquarian—profoundly read in history, and most accurate and painstaking as an Irish archæologist. But once that theme was broached there was no longer room for question. There was not a rath or dun, or old tombstone, or ruined church in the whole country that he had not visited, explored and tabulated. He knew the date when churches were built, parishes subdivided, and what connection they had with the departed worthies of the Church. I have before me now a letter written to me while rector of Killeevan by the late Evelyn Philip Shirley, of Lough Fea, and of Ettington Park, Stratford-on-Avon, well known as the editor of the State papers and one of the members of the Royal Commission of 1868, himself no mean authority in matters connected with ecclesiastical history and author among other works of the history of the County of Monaghan, Mr. Shirley says:—"I have no difficulty as to the succession of incumbents or ancient history of the parish, as I have ascertained all those particulars from the Dean of Armagh."

Dr. Reeves was intellectually a great man, yet what struck people who knew him most of all was how entirely he was unconscious of his greatness. It was not merely that he was endowed with humility, but that he seemed unconscious that he had any reason to think highly of himself; he was simple in his tastes and as easily pleased as a child, yet no man had higher views regarding the respect due to his office, and there was never any doubt possible to those who met him officially that to deal with William Reeves the man was one thing, and with William Lord Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore a different matter altogether. Yet here it was the office he sought to magnify, not the man. For my own part, while I hold views as to the episcopate similar to his, yet I feel that this high office added no lustre to this man, but on the contrary the episcopate was the gainer by having reflected on it the honour that shone from a character "whose goodness overshadowed its greatness." Presently I shall refer to his career as a scholar and a writer, but just here I should like to quote the tender touching words of the Dean of St. Patrick's at the funeral service in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, on Thursday, January 14, 1892—words that expressed what many felt—words that seemed to set visibly before those who knew him, the strong tender nature that knew how to sympathise because he had learned in the school of Christ how "to suffer and be strong," the will of iron where principle was involved, the deep ever-welling gentleness where no question of duty was touched, the strong stern resolute purpose that nothing could shake or bend, and the keen flashes of a humour that always sparkled but never left behind a feeling of pain or of humiliation:—

"There are some men whose goodness so overshadows their greatness that we are apt to forget how great they were in merely thinking how good they were. There are men of great intellectual power whose gentle lovingness is such that we are quite satisfied to think of them as gentle, loving friends, and forget the powers of intellect which were bestowed upon them by God. I think a great deal of that was true as regards our dear brother who has been taken away from us; at least I speak of him as I felt of him myself, having known him intimately for many years, and having sometimes enjoyed the pleasure of conversing with him—and it was a pleasure to converse with him. It always seemed to me that I used to forget how far above me he was in all intellectual

attainments, and that I was merely thinking of the pleasure of his friendship, and I daresay the same is true of many others. He was a man, no doubt, of great intellectual powers—a man whose life has left its stamp on this age; but of this I am not going to speak, and many of you who are here know more of him in that capacity than I do. I would rather speak of that lovableness of his nature, his gentleness, his meekness and his humility for a man of his power. I think I seldom met with a man who seemed so unconscious of his power, who seemed so humble, even though he possessed such intellectual power and such an amount of knowledge. His retentive memory supplied him with a store of information upon almost every subject, but for all that he was one of the most humble and gentle of men, that I daresay many of you have ever known. I could if I cared to detain you give many instances of that great humility of his character. Perhaps I had better mention one. When the Disestablishment of the Irish Church took place, and when it was thought right by the Synod that there should be a revision of our formularies, it was entrusted, as you are aware, to a committee to suggest the alterations which it was fit should be made. Of that committee the late bishop was one; he was more than that, he was secretary of the committee. I sat with him for many a day on that committee while we were discussing things which to his mind were wholly displeasing. He never wished to see any change made in the Prayer Book, and never consented to it; but while he sat there all these days, seldom even speaking a word, but faithfully recording all that passed in those meetings, in which were said very many things that grated upon his mind, but all of which he kept his faithful account of as secretary. He did that in the humility of his heart. It seemed to him I have no doubt that, being appointed to an office in which he might serve the Church, he must submit patiently to all the unpleasantnesses that were brought with it; and so in his whole life there was always that humility manifested in all his acts and words. As regards the kindliness of his nature, he was a man full of anecdote; he was very fond of telling the stories which he had stored up in his mind, and which always came out on every occasion; and yet I do not think any one ever heard him saying an unkind thing or telling an unkind story, showing always the same character, not only of gentleness, but also of tenderness. These are the aspects of his character by which he will be remembered by many who were not capable of judging, and who did not understand his attainments in other ways. Ireland has lost a son who was more familiar with the antiquities of her race than almost any other man in the kingdom. The Church of Ireland has lost one who was a faithful son to her in every position in which he was placed, from the lowest to the highest; and many and many a one, both here and elsewhere, have lost a friend whose memory will remain long fresh in their hearts." Savonarola used to say that "a man knows as much as he works," but work is not invariably commensurate with knowledge. In the case of Dr. Reeves, however, the amount of work crowded into one life is most marvellous. I have already referred to his readiness to help forward those who applied to him for information and advice, but the general public do not know how far he made this the rule of his life. Here I may quote one illustration. In 1884 I wrote to him on the subject of a history of Ireland suitable for schools and for popular purposes. For some years previously, finding myself in a quiet country parish I had devoted all my leisure to the study of Irish history, and the want of some such work was present in my mind. The reply is very characteristic.

"The Library, Armagh,
"February 18th, 1884.

"DEAR MR. NAYLOR,—Your letter of January 28th has long been on the table, but its position is more owing to the difficulty I have in answering it than to any neglect or indifference to the subject of it. The history of Ireland is to be of a mixed character, 'Church annals woven into those of the country.' That is a bold undertaking, and comprising as it necessarily does the whole history, national, civil, and ecclesiastical—an extremely wide field, and one which to be successfully occupied demands a supply of working materials greater than any private library in Ireland, except possibly Lough Fea possesses; all printed matter which is accessible in the three departments has been repeatedly produced and reproduced. The ecclesiastical side has been ably handled by Dr. Lanigan and Mr. King; the secular portion is less fortunate. The printed histories of Ireland from old Keating down to Moore are dull, partial, inaccurate, and unscholarly. One man writes to show off his style, another man like Cox deals with one and a very dry class of records, another is biased by religion, and another by politics, and among them all there is much uncertainty and disappointment. Every day is unquarrying fine blocks of historical matter, but they will require much power and much skill to utilise them. A popular work on Irish history must possess a charm to be successful—research, new materials, skill, style. I should be happy to afford you any assistance, advice, or encouragement in my power, and if you send the MSS. by parcel post to the rectory, I will examine it, and honestly tell you what I think. . . .

"Yours sincerely,
WM. REEVES."

At the time of his death Dr. Reeves was in his seventy-seventh year, having been born in Charleville, in the County of Cork, March 16, 1815. His father, Mr. Boles Reeves, was an eminent Dublin solicitor, and his mother was daughter of Jonathan Bence Roberts, who served with a captain's commission in the American War of Independence. He entered Trinity College, Dublin, of which he became a scholar in 1833, and graduated in 1835. He studied theology and medicine at the same time, and took out his degree as Bachelor of Medicine in 1837. On March 18, 1838, he was ordained deacon by Mant, Bishop of Down and Connor, to serve as curate of Blaris, at Lisburn, and in 1839 was ordained priest by Ponsonby, Bishop of Derry. He was appointed in 1841 curate of Kilconriola, near Ballymena, where he remained until 1857. Here he proceeded to the degrees of M.A. and B.D. in 1849, and here too he published in 1847 the first of those learned works on Irish ecclesiastical history, which will in future times give his name a place with Ussher and Ware among the most learned antiquarians ever produced in Ireland: "Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor and Dromore, consisting of a Taxation of those Dioceses compiled in the year MCCCVI., with Notes and Illustrations by the Rev. William Reeves, M.B, M.R.I.A., Perpetual Curate of Kilconriola, in the Diocese of Connor. Dublin, 1847.

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"IS THERE A PURGATORY?"

SIR,—"J. B." in his letter of the 30th ult. says "that if the opinion of the Bishop (Manchester) is correct, the English Bible gives very false impressions in relation to the inspired utterances on future punishments." This is bad grammar; he should have said if the opinion *be* correct. And the answer is, that the Bible makes no such false impressions, therefore the Bishop is wrong. But your readers will notice how he shifts the responsibility of the Bible "speaking falsely" to the shoulders of the Bishop. He has quoted him and Jerome *ad nauseam;* but I have nothing to do with either of them at present. My business is principally with "J. B.'s" arguments, of which he appears to have none except those borrowed from other people. In a former letter (January 9), he had laid it down as a rule to guide us in this discussion that we should "speak the truth in love," but I should like to know where his love was when he wrote his last letter. I am afraid that it was like the "morning cloud and the early dew"; it had "passed away." He would like us to believe that his love would embrace the whole world in final restoration to eternal bliss; yet when he is pricked with the goad of truth he loses his temper, and kicks against the wholesome words of "truth and soberness."

"Vicar's" mind seems to be racked with real doubt. In this case human reason can be of little avail by itself to comfort a man; recourse must be had to earnest and believing prayer for the teaching of the Holy Spirit. Apparently, it is a thorough acquaintance with his Bible that he most needs at present.

He says Paradise (for the few with Lazarus); Purgatory (for the many with Dives). He seems not to have observed that the Bible says that Dives "lifted up his eyes in hell." Hell is not Purgatory. The grace of God never reaches a man in hell, and without it no "chastisement" of any kind would purify his soul. The phrase "remedial punishment" as applied to the condition of the people in that place is a glaring misnomer, founded upon the ignorance of the difference in meaning between hell and purgatory. The impossibility of receiving grace in the former place is the "great fixed gulf" over which Dives could not pass to heaven. It is an awful thought, but not more awful than true. There is only one Purgatory, and that is the blood of Christ, available now in this lifetime, and only now. It transcends the bounds of all reason for men to ask for or look for another. Why does not "Vicar" make a practical test of the matter by going personally to the throne of grace for his own salvation? A consciousness of his "grievous failures" is the best qualification for this purpose. And if he ask for grace earnestly, penitently, and believingly, it will not be long before he come into the condition of the "happy ones and blessed." The humblest intellect can take in the meaning of "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." And what a "few" had done all may do. If they don't do it, it is their own fault. "Vicar" says again, "My failures are grievous, and how are my uncertainties increased, when I may preach Liddon to-day and Farrar to-morrow!" But may I ask what necessity is he under of preaching either the one or the other? Has he no independence of judgment, no thoughts of his own? Why not preach Christ crucified? "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." "In Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." And "if any man lack knowledge, let Him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not."

Were the subject not too serious I would say that Mr. Murphy only meant to amuse your readers when he attempted, in his last letter, to set aside the authority of Aristotle on the derivation of a Greek word He says if Aristotle so derives it (αἰὼν from ἀεὶὼν) this proves nothing; for the ancient Greeks studied no language but their own, and the roots of Greek, as of most other languages, are not to be found in the language itself." This sentence ought to be preserved in the Archives of the Philological Society. The arrogant assumption of self-constituted authority which breathes through it is truly appalling. It is a pity in one way to spoil the "charm of his dear delusion," but I think we can with much greater propriety reverse the sentiment and say, that if Mr. Murphy *denies* that the word is so derived it "proves nothing," "nothing" at all, because Mr. Murphy is no authority in the matter. We might have fancied that he had authority if he had produced what he thinks is the right "root"; but no such root having been produced it is plain that he had none, and therefore the derivation of Aristotle must stand for anything Mr. Murphy has shown to the contrary. It is a great piece of folly to say that an author is wrong and not to furnish the proof. It is instructive to notice his reason for setting aside the authority of Aristotle. He says "the roots of Greek are not found in the language itself." No roots at all? So he seems to say. No *Greek* roots for purely *Greek* words! In Dr. Arnold's Greek Accidence, which most boys learn at school, there is a mass of information about the "roots" of Greek words. But then I forgot; after setting aside Aristotle Dr. Arnold will be no authority to Mr. Murphy. I must pass on to the grand climax of his reasoning, which he reaches by saying that the derivation of Aristotle is probably on a par with deriving "climax from "climb"; and then adds, a "derivation which might appear plausible to a person totally ignorant of any language but English." Which means that, because there is a number of words in the English language which have entered it from the Greek, Latin, and other languages, Aristotle was wrong in deriving a Greek word from a Greek root, just as if there are no English words in the English language which an Englishman could derive from an English, or Anglo-Saxon root! This erudite reasoning of Mr. Murphy is worthy of the attention of philologists. To say the least of it, it is quite a gratuitous assumption to say that Aristotle studied no language but his own; and there is no Englishman, who sets about deriving words from roots, so "totally ignorant of any language but English" as to make the blunders which Mr. Murphy tries to invent for the purpose of his argument.

In Liddell and Scott's Lexicon (sixth edition, revised and augmented, 1869), page 41, we read, "on αἰὼν as the *complete period*, either of each particular life or of *all existence*, v. Arist. Coel. i. 9, 15; (V. sub ἀεὶ)." Turning to ἀεὶ, page 23, we read, "the root is AIF, which appears in Latin ævum, æ(vi)tas, æternus; *hence also* αἰὼν." This needs no comment.

To show the "authority" with which he speaks when he says that the primary meaning of αἰὼν is a limited time, he quotes "the end of the world" (Matt. xiii. 39); "times eternal" (2 Tim. i. 9); he then goes on to "eternal God" (Rom. xvi. 25); and says it is here rightly translated "eternal," but adds that the word is "*indefinite* as a word of duration." He set out to prove that it has the *definite* meaning of a limited duration, and the result he arrives at is that it is "indefinite!" Could anything be more ridiculous? To arrive at a conclusion the very contradictory of what he wished to establish, and then to say that he has proved his point! This, then, is the measure of *his* authority. Consequently, according to this result, the duration of "eternal punishment" is "indefinite"; it may be limited or unlimited, he cannot say which. But he interprets the phrase on this ground by saying that he "sees no certainty, nor strong presumption that eternal punishment must be of equal duration with the life promised to the merciful." But sure, when the word is "*indefinite*," he ought in order to have expressed the *whole truth*, to have added, "neither is there any certainty or strong presumption that it *won't* be of equal duration with the life of the merciful." He mentioned this "presumptuous" theory in a former letter, and in my last I asked him a question about it which he has not thought fit to answer. I asked him to tell me, *looking at this indefinite meaning of the word*, how he knew that the "presumption" existed in the one case and not in the other? I must now repeat the question. What are the marks (regard being had to the indefinite meaning of the word) which lead him to know that the "presumption" of a limited duration exists in the case of "eternal punishment" and does not exist in the case of "eternal life?" *How* does the "presumption" change or lose its marks in passing from the one phrase to the other in Matt. xxv. 46? The truth is, his "presumption" theory is a delusion. It is not then to be wondered at that I would show somewhat more "deference" to the English translators of the Bible than to Mr. Murphy. But I did not "think that they were an authority beyond which it is needless to appeal"; consequently my deference is not "excessive," nor is it as great as his for the Revised Version, which he uses at every turn when he "thinks" it will suit his purpose better. He admits that in some places the English translators have rendered the word αἰὼν with perfect fidelity to the meaning"; this is exactly what I contend has been done (Matt. xxv. 46), where it is rendered "eternal" and "everlasting," both meaning endless.

February 4th, 1892. R. DONALDSON.

SIR,—In my letter I stated, as a question, "There must be some use in Paradise." I should have written Hades, supposing Paradise and Purgatory the two sides of Hades. In the parable of Dives and Lazarus the former is making much use of hell, and the latter no use of Paradise, as he is asleep.

The question of eternity, everlasting, etc., seems to gain ground in the minds of men as a measure of time, perhaps finding its limit when time shall be no more. Hence, without accepting the doctrine of universalism in its broadest sense, Purgatory comes in to make universalism possible after punishment for sin by purgation. For an illustration that all may be saved: Adam and Eve, after their expulsion, are promised a Saviour. Was not this promise made to all the world lying in their loins? When Israel was brought out of Egypt, *all* were ordered to sprinkle the doorposts with blood. Were *all* good? Yet all were brought out of Egypt. When Esau came in with his venison, he expected a blessing; he found Jacob had supplanted him, though he had sold his birthright and deserved to lose. Yet the father found another blessing. Could the dying prayer of Jesus on the Cross for His murderers be unanswered?

The doctrine of the Trinity is a vast comfort to me. God is One yet Three Persons. Peter and Paul will receive the blessing of all Three; the other rank of saints *may* receive only the blessing of the Father and the Son, the third rank receiving the blessing of the Father only.

I believe there is a Purgatory, not connected with Rome and its indulgences.

February 6th. VICAR.

THE Rev R. C. Glennie, M.A. of Keble College, Oxford, recently appointed resident chaplain to the Archbishop of York, will enter upon his duties on March 1st.

THE Rev W. F. Chambers, who recently, under circumstances of physical depression, was received into the Roman Communion, has been received back again into the English Church, at St. Peter's, Folkestone, under a commission from the Archbishop of Canterbury.

THE question of Cardinal Newman's statue came before the Oxford City Councilon the 3rd inst., and after a long public debate, it was agreed, by 37 votes to 16, to grant a site, and a small committee was appointed to consider where it should be, on the understanding that Broad Street should be excluded. The council contains altogether sixty-five members, and almost all were present at the debate, but some went out without voting.

THE Professor of Music, at Oxford, whose energy and zeal makes his tenure of office noteworthy indeed, is making again a fresh departure this term. He is arranging for a series of public lectures in the Sheldonian Theatre to be given, one by himself and others by deputies whom he appoints, on different subjects connected with the history or theory of music. As the lecturers selected are all of them masters in their different lines, we do not doubt the course will prove very attractive.

THE Archbishop of York recently announced that a few graduates would be received at Bishopthorpe for training for holy orders. The first term of the *Schola Archiepiscopi* began on Monday week under the superintendence of the Rev. J. R. Keble, vicar of Bishopthorpe. A limited number of graduates will reside at the vicarage. The usual course will be one year, consisting of three terms of ten to twelve weeks each. The course of lectures will follow, as a rule, the subjects for the diaconate examination in the diocese. Special opportunities will be offered of gaining experience in ministerial work.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has, by arrangement with the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, recommended to them the Rev. J. Cullin, one of the Six Preachers of the cathedral, for appointment to the vicarage of St. Matthew's, Upper Clapton, in the patronage of the Chapter, which is about to be vacated by the removal, at the request of the Chapter, of the

present vicar thereof, the Rev. L. H. Bradford, to the rectory of Hunton, in the patronage of the Archbishop. Mr. Cullin resigned in 1885, at his Grace's request, the rectory of Oughtrington, Chesire, to take up for five years the work of Tait Missioner in the Diocese of Canterbury.

BODLEY'S LIBRARIAN, at Oxford, who is ever on the look out for stray pieces of information which may be interesting to posterity in the remote future, is inviting the undergraduates through the different colleges to furnish him with such information respecting themselves and their personal history as may be likely to prove of interest. It may be doubted whether the attempt to obtain such information is well judged. The passion for petty personal detail by which we are haunted to-day is scarcely likely to be permanent, and to have collected such details will seem to posterity an instance of curious but perverse ingenuity. Posterity is likely to suffer not from knowing too little but too much about us. We persuade ourselves that ourselves and all that concerns us is more interesting than it is ever likely to prove.

THE Rev. M. A. Dodds has been accepted by the C.M.S. for service in the foreign mission-field. The Correspondence Committee took leave, last Tuesday week, of Miss Effie P. Buxton, who is proceeding as an honorary missionary to Japan, to join the Rev. Barclay F. Buxton's party. Mr. J. Fowell Buxton, of Easneye, spoke on behalf of his daughter.

THE annual meeting of the Mersey Mission to Seamen was held at Liverpool last Monday week, under the presidency of the Mayor, who moved the adoption of the report, and the Bishop of Chester in seconding said that the chaplains should not attempt to take sides between employer and employed. It was a cheap way of obtaining a little passing popularity at various trade crises, but he thought it a great mistake for ministers of religion to go lightly in, even with the best intentions. They should do their best to help forward friendly relations between master and man, and he was glad to know that such was the policy adopted by the representatives of this mission. The resolution having been adopted, Bishop Royston said that the Bishop of the diocese was extremely grieved at being absent through indisposition. One great feature of the society was the unity and co-operation of the lay and clerical element not only upon the committee, but also in the actual working out of that important Mission.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barrass, Rev. J. Stephen, Clerical Secretary of the Church of England Young Men's Society; Chaplain of Bethlehem Hospital.

Baynes, Rev. A. Hamilton, M.A.; Vicar of Christ Church, Greenwich.

Bradford, Rev. L. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Upper Clapton; Rector of Hunton, Kent.

Bridger, Rev. John, Curate of the Parish Church, Liverpool, and Organising Secretary of the S.P.C.K.; Vicar of Rainford, St. Helen's.

Chettoe, Rev. S. E., M.A., Wilberforce Diocesan Missioner, with the charge of St. Gabriel's, Newsington, S.E.; Vicar of St. John's, Woolwich.

Churchill, Rev. E. B., M.A., Curate of Ruardean, Forest of Dean, Gloucestershire; Vicar of Tattershall, Boston, Lincolnshire.

Crellin, Rev. C. E., M.A., Chaplain of Derby Goal; Chaplain of Borstal Convict Prison, near Chatham.

Crick, Rev. A. C., M.A.; Vicar of Pennington, Hants.

Curling, Rev. Joseph James, B.A.; Vicar of Hamble-le-Rice, Hants.

Ding, Rev. W., Private Chaplain to the late R. E. Egerton-Warburton, of Arley Hall, Cheshire; Consular Chaplain at Pernambuco, Brazil.

Dyer, Rev. A. Saunders, M.A., Bengal Chaplain; Curate-in-Charge of Conington, Cambridgeshire.

Eaton, Rev. J. R. T., M.A., Rector of Denton; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Deanery of Redenhall.

Eck, Rev. H. V. S., B.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of London.

Forbes, Rev. Charles James Duncan, B.A.; Vicar of Ugley, Essex.

Glennie, Rev. R. G., M.A.; Resident Chaplain to the Archbishop of York.

Hosken, Rev. R. F., M.A., Assistant-Master at Merchant Taylors' School; Honorary Chaplain to the Horner's Company.

Houghton, Rev. Edward James, M.A., Vicar of Blockley; Honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral.

Leeke, Rev. W.; Rector of Longford, Shropshire.

Longhurst, Rev. William H. R., M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Queenhill, Worcestershire.

Lumsdon, Rev. John; Priest-in-Charge of the South-Eastern Mission, South Australia.

Moore, Rev. William, Rector of Drumgooland; Incumbent of St. Patrick's, Newry.

Quennell, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Tring; Rector of Shenfield, near Brentwood.

Randall, Rev. Richard William, Vicar of All Saint's, Clifton, and Honorary Canon of Bristol; Dean of Chichester.

Roderick, Rev. E. M., M.A., Private Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Asaph; Vicar of Mold, Flintshire.

Ross, Rev. G. Gould, D.C.L., Vicar of Treneglos-with-Warbstow; Rector of Michaelstow, Cornwall.

Swayne, Rev. William S., Lichfield Diocesan Missioner; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Walsall.

Walsh, Rev. G. N., B.A.; East London Clergyman.

Wilkinson, Rev. Thomas H., M.A., Vicar of Ratley, near Banbury; Vicar of Stainton-in-Cleveland, Yorkshire.

Williams, Rev. John Wright, Vicar of Rainford, St. Helen's; Vicar of Farnworth, near Widnes.

Young, Rev. Gabliel; Vicar of Bawburgh, Norfork.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bond, Rev. George, Vicar of Farnworth, near Widnes, Lancashire, on the 1st inst., aged 63.

Brown, Rev. J. Cassels, at Gravesend, on the 1st inst., aged 51.

Christie, Rev. William Nevin, B.A., late Curate of Pencombe, at Mentone, France, on the 4th inst., aged 28.

Harison, Rev. John, late Vicar of Bishopstone, at Wherwell Vicarage, on the 1st inst., aged 82.

Harrison, Rev. William Anthony, M.A., Rector of Barnes, at the Rectory, on the 6th inst., aged 63.

Isham, Rev. Arthur, M.A., formerly Rector of Weston Turville, at Cawood, Reigate, on the 4th inst., aged 82.

McCaul, Rev. J. B., Rector of St. Michael's, Bassishaw, and Hon. Canon of Rochester, at 11, Flanders-road, W., on the 3rd inst.

Mather, Rev. George, M.A., Rector and Prebendary of Lichfield, at Longford Rectory, Newport, Salop, on the 1st inst., aged 69.

Miller, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Ashbury, Berks, Rural Dean, and formerly Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, on the 4th inst., in his 64th year.

Scratchley, Rev. Charles James, for many years Rector of Lydeard St. Lawrence, Taunton, at 5, St. Matthias-terrace, Torquay, on the 28th ult., aged 77.

Short, Rev. John Holbeche, at Temple Balsall, Warwickshire, on the 7th inst., aged 80.

Toke, Rev. Richard Roundell, fifty-five years Rector of the parish, at Barnston, near Dunmow, on the 31st ult., aged 87.

Valpy, Rev. John Montagu, late Vicar of St. John Baptist's, Nottingham, at Sudbury, on the 6th inst., aged 68.

The Church of England Pulpit.

TIMES OF PESTILENCE.

By the Rev. WILLIAM INCE, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

Sermon Preached in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, on Sunday Jan. 24th, 1892.

"Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time: casting all your care upon Him; for He careth for you."—1 Peter v. 6, 7.

THE people to whom these exhortations were addressed were obviously at the time enduring considerable affliction, caused, it would seem, by the profession of their Christian faith. They were members of the newly-founded Churches in the Asiatic provinces of the Roman Empire, "in heaviness for a season through manifold temptations," undergoing a distinct "trial of faith," "evil spoken of as evildoers." They are described as likely immediately to encounter "a fiery trial," being reproached for the name of Christ. They are implored not to call down upon themselves punishments from their heathen fellow-countrymen on the ground of their being murderers, or thieves, or busybodies in other men's matters; yet not to be ashamed if they are compelled to suffer as Christians. They are reminded that their suffering is according to the will of God, Who desires to chasten them and test the sincerity of their faith and love; and therefore they are invited to commit the keeping of their souls to Him in well-doing as unto a faithful Creator. They are further exhorted to a temper of humility alike towards God and towards each other. What I ask you now more particularly to observe is that this subjection to suffering and affliction is regarded by the Apostle Peter as being an infliction of the strong, mighty hand of God. That is a recognition of the mysterious truth, which baffles complete solution either from philosophy or religion—that evil in some way comes from God. He is supreme goodness, supreme love, supreme righteousness, and yet in the administration of His world He allows varied forms of physical evil to befall men. Sometimes He appears directly to inflict it, for He is represented to us under the image of fatherly government as exercised among men. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?" Divine chastisement, which comes to those who are subject to the Father of Spirits, is for our ultimate profit that we may be partakers of His holiness, and it is guided by wisdom and love, free from all wanton arbitrariness. But the endurance of suffering does not always produce submission of spirit, humility, recognition of a Divine purpose of aiding men's moral and spiritual improvement. It is not easy always to connect together effect and cause, and to be sure that some terrible evil which assails a community or a nation is a direct punishment from God, the Father of the universe, whether it is, as ancient and modern thought have conceived it, a scourge in the hand of the Almighty Chastiser, or, as Christian theology has constantly called it, a judgment. The effects of such judgments, if they are rightly so interpreted, have been in many cases salutary. They have been received as loud calls to reformation of manners, to humiliation of souls before God, prompted by the consciousness of former sin and forgetfulness of the Divine Majesty. They have brought moral good out of the crushing evil. But history shows too unmistakably that this has not always been the case. Hardness of heart and utter recklessness have been the sad results of some of these destructive visitations. Let me recall to your memories two famous instances—one in pre-Christian, one in Christian times. The first shall be the plague at Athens in the second year of the Peloponnesian war. We have the advantage here of having the narrative of the great historian Thucydides, a sufferer as well as a spectator, who has analysed its moral effects with the accuracy and profoundness of reflection for which he is distinguished. After he has described all its ghastly physical horrors, he proceeds to say—

"The great licentiousness which also in other kinds was used in the city began at first from this disease. For men more readily ventured on things which they formerly concealed, or durst not do freely and at their pleasure, seeing before their eyes such quick revolution of the rich dying, and men worth nothing inheriting their estates, inasmuch as they judged it best to enjoy their fortunes bravely and merrily, considering them and their lives alike held from day to day. As for pains, no man was forward in any action of honour to take any, because they thought it uncertain whether they should die or not before they achieved it. But that which produced present enjoyment, or which immediately led to it, was now received to be both honourable and advantageous. Neither the fear of the gods nor laws of men awed any man. Not the former, because they concluded it was alike to worship or not worship, from seeing that alike they all perished; nor the latter, because no man expected his life would last till he received punishment of his crimes by judgment. But they thought there was now over their heads some far greater judgment decreed against them, before which fell they thought to enjoy some little part of their lives."

This was an incident in the life of a heathen nation, among whom there was no popular working belief in a future life. This forgetfulness of every duty towards God and man in the intoxication of universal danger led to the extreme development in practice of the maxim, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." But our second instance will show that among a Christian nation, not long after the death of a great Christian poet like Dante, the same demoralisation may occur. The plague of Florence, which lasted for five months in 1348, carrying off 100,000 people, has been vividly described by Boccaccio and by the native historian, Matteo Villani. The historian has drawn a lurid picture of its moral effects:—

"In this season of the deadly pestilence, the Pope (Clement VI.) made great general indulgences of the punishment of all sins to those who on repentance and confession requested it of their confessors, and died; and in this mortality every Christian, thinking that he was dying, set himself well in order, and with much contrition and repentance they gave up their souls to God. And the few wise men who remained alive expected many things, which, through the corruption of sin, turned out otherwise, the very contrary most marvellously coming to pass. For they thought that such as God by His favour had kept alive, having seen the extermination of their nearest connections, and having heard the like tidings of all the nations of the world, would have become of better condition—humble, virtuous, of the true faith, and would have kept themselves from iniquities and sins, and would have been full of love and charity one towards another. But now that the mortality was at an end the contrary appeared, for men, finding themselves few and rich by their heirships and successions to earthly things, forgetting things past as if they had never been, gave in to a more unhandsome and disorderly life than they had used before. For wandering about at leisure they dissolutely indulged in the sin of gluttony, banquets, taverns, delicate food, gaming, running without bridle into luxury, which they sought in strange clothing and unusual fashions and unseemly manners. . . . . And almost all our city, without any check, ran into a discreditable course of life, and so, and worse, did the other cities and provinces of the world. And, according to all the accounts we have received, there was no place where the living kept themselves in continency when they had escaped from the Divine wrath, supposing that the hand of God was weary."

We have in this mediæval history an appalling instance that the mighty hand of God when stretched forth does not always lead a Christian people to humiliation before God, but hardens them to bold licentiousness and reckless violation of laws, human and Divine.

What is our immediate duty? First, if I may be allowed to repeat what I said in another place last Sunday morning, not to give way to panic. Fear, according to the definition of one of the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, is nothing else but the betraying of the succours which reason offers. Therefore, simply and solely as reasonable men and women, we are bound to take all reasonable precautions in regard to our bodies. Those of us who by God's good providence are placed under favourable circumstances are bound to take adequate food and clothe themselves with warm raiment, and observe the known precautionary laws of health so far as skilled medical science has been able to proclaim them; and, let me specially emphasize, to help to provide for those who are less favourably situated owing to their poverty and their necessarily greater exposure supplies of the same advantages. . . . .

But then in regard to the higher aspects of this critical time, our condition of soul, and our relation to God, I believe the one stay by which we may support ourselves, if we really wish to take the attitude which befits Christian people, is the thought of the particular providence of God, to which the text from St. Peter directs us, casting all your care, your anxiety, upon God, for He careth for you. If we believe at all in a living God, and in a future life, we are shut up to the belief that men, whether living or dead, are under the care of God; they are not withdrawn from His protection and His love because they are removed from this earthly scene. The Christian doctrine is, "None of us liveth to himself, and none of us dieth to himself. For whether we live we live unto the Lord, and whether we die we die unto the Lord. Whether we live, therefore, or die we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died and rose and revived that He might be Lord both of dead and living." He careth for us. If it be true that "all alone, so Heaven has will'd, we die," it is also true that God's care is bestowed not on humanity as an indistinguishable whole, but on each separate individual, however impossible it may be for us with our limited imagination to comprehend the method of this specialisation of universal benevolence. Christ Himself has taught us this with startling clearness. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows." God is with us in sickness and in health, in the cloudy day as well as in the sunshine; in the valley and shadow of death He can sustain us; even there we need fear no evil, for He is with us; His rod and His staff can strengthen and comfort us. Why should a Christian fall below the deep apprehension of the Divine omnipresence to which a pre-Christian Psalmist could attain? "Whither shall I go then from Thy Spirit, or whither shall I go then from Thy presence? If I climb up into heaven Thou art there, if I go down to hell (*i.e.*, the grave) Thou art there also. If I take the

wings of the morning and remain in the uttermost parts of the sea—even there also shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me." Let us humble ourselves under His mighty hand, now seemingly outstretched upon our land. Such humiliation will induce us to examine the state of our hearts towards God, to acknowledge and bewail our own distance from Him, and form earnest resolutions to live nearer to Him in the future. It will send us to the cross of our Saviour, there to see the heinousness of sin and the love manifested in the redemption; it will determine us with penitent faith to put our whole trust and confidence in the one availing propitiation made for sin by the blood-shedding of the Incarnate God: if we recognise that suffering is a chastisement we may see that, however grievous for the time it may be, yet in the end it has a loving purpose. And this temper of mind will be suitable for us, even if the visitation be not personal sickness but bereavement and loss of our loved ones. Thus prepared we may listen profitably to consolations which otherwise seem cheerless and mock our irreparable grief:—

> Then pass, ye mourners, cheerly on,
> Through prayer unto the tomb,
> Still as ye watch life's falling leaf,
> Gathering from every loss and grief
> Hope of new spring and endless home.

And then the wise rule for present action follows:—

> Then cheerly to your work again
> With hearts new brac'd and set
> To run, untir'd, loves blessed race
> As meet for those, who face to face
> Over the grave their Lord have met.

Let it not be thought selfish or narow-minded if, while we are all lying under the dark shadow of a mighty national grief, of which those memorial services held here as elsewhere on Wednesday last were a signal and memorable manifestation, we in this place make reference to two losses which nearly concern ourselves. Within the last fortnight we have been deprived by death of two Honorary Canons of this cathedral, both of them vicars of Oxford parishes. When I was speaking from this pulpit this day fortnight I spoke of a dear friend, Mr. Freeling, the vicar of Holywell, who then lay dying; within three hours afterwards he was called to his rest. I shall not go over again the thoughts which were uttered with such true and generous sympathy in nearly every pulpit in Oxford last Sunday. This only will I mention as a wonderful instance of unanimous estimate of character; four different letters from his old friends and colleagues by an undesigned coincidence summed up their remarks by speaking of the departed as an example of "simple goodness"—an epitaph which we might well desire for ourselves. On Wednesday last there followed to his rest another well known in Oxford, Mr. Chamberlain, the vicar of St. Thomas's. In him there was not an instance of one cut off in the prime of his youth, as our Royal Prince, or by a sudden illness like Mr. Freeling. He has "come to his grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in in his season." For sixty-four years, I believe, Mr. Chamberlain has been on the foundation as a student of Christ Church; for fifty years he has been vicar of St. Thomas's. Delicate health has withdrawn him from public gaze for some years past; but in his time he has wrought a brave and noble work. I can well remember, in my undergraduate days, the terrible outward signs of immorality and ungodliness which met the eye in the neighbourhood where he was called to labour. It was almost impossible on coming in from walks to pass by the corners of the streets facing what now is the North-Western Railway station without being assailed by coarse sounds and sights from thieves, drunkards, and prostitutes who haunted those purlieus. In his early days I have been told that Mr. Chamberlain, who boldly rebuked vice and constantly spoke the truth, was called upon to suffer for the truth's sake. I believe he was assailed with outspoken abuse and even stoned in the streets; but he persevered through evil report and good report: Poverty and misery,—which seem to cling to our social system,—have not been eradicated; yet he has lived to see peace and calm in his parish and congregation. He has organised schools, established a Sisterhood, full of good works by fostering education and visiting the sick and poor of the neighbourhood; he has borne his full share in all the modern expansion of Church activity by urging on the erection of such buildings as model lodging-houses, and only within the last few weeks he has erected at his own expense and seen opened a Jubilee hall, to be used for purposes of instruction, recreation, and social gatherings, as well as for vestries. In his earlier days he made several contributions to theological literature. In his later life, when unable to take part in the public services of his Church, he has done much by private instructions in his own house. The memory of his assiduous, self-sacrificing, persevering life, shaming opposition, and outliving unpopularity, will not easily pass away. Of his successors, whoever they may be, it will be true to say—Other men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours.

And so in this chequered life we move amidst sunshine and gloom, rejoicing and weeping, hoping and disappointment. There has been such a contrast within the walls of this cathedral during this week. One day it was filled to its utmost capacity by a great congregation taking part in a solemn memorial service, token of profound sympathy with the national bereavement, and the next day with a very full congregation witnessing the inauguration by quaint archaic forms yet instinct with religious sentiment of the new ruler of this cathedral church and this house of education. Had not the alarming prevalence among us of the insidious epidemic led in pursuance of unhesitating

medical opinion to the postponement of the actual commencement of our academic term, I should not have been standing here to-day, but the new Dean would have been addressing—not certainly as a stranger, but as the fresh occupant of a more exalted office than before—the young men who would in the ordinary course of things have formed the main bulk of the congregation. As it is, I feel that I speak to-day in what for the time is only a cathedral, and not also a college chapel, and so I will end by commending to the good wishes and the earnest prayers of the city and the diocese him who, in the full prime of life, succeeds a great predecessor, retiring full of years and honours and high reputation. Pray for him that he may do good service to the Church at large, to the inhabitants of this city so far as they come under his influence direct or indirect, to the Chapter in the improvement of its usefulness to the diocese at large; pray for him that he may be richly endowed with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness; and, being filled with the spirit of God's holy fear, may labour for the common profit of the city, the diocese, the University, as well as of the collegiate foundation of King Henry VIII.

DEATH.

By the Rev. CHARLES C. COLLINS, M.A., Vicar of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury.

Sermon Preached with Reference to the Lamented Death of H.R.H. the Duke of Clarence, at the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury, on 17th January, 1892.

"There is but a step between me and death."—1 Sam. xx. 3.

IN one of those fits of melancholy, with which Saul was afflicted after he had through disobedience forfeited God's favour, he made an attempt upon the life of David, and consequently David fled from the court. After wandering from place to place David came at length to Ramah, and there had an interview with Saul's son respecting his father's conduct. Jonathan loved David "as his own soul," and determined to do all he could for David's safety. "God forbid thou shalt not" was his earnest exclamation, when David asked, "What is my sin before thy father, that he seeketh my life?"—David was greatly distressed and conscious of peril in spite of Jonathan's assurance and support. "Thy father," said he, "certainly knoweth that I have found grace in thine eyes, and he sayeth, 'Let not Jonathan know this, lest he be grieved,' but truly as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, there is but a step between me and death." The words describe David's position and expresses his keen sensibility to danger through the ill-feeling of Saul towards him. His life was in peril.

The text, however, will bear a wider application. It is descriptive of everyone's position in this world. "There is but a step between us and death" not because we are like David, expectant heirs of a temporal throne, or objects of royal persecution, but because the tenure of life is absolutely uncertain, and because as heirs through hope of a kingdom eternal in the heavens, we are exposed to the malice of a spiritual enemy the prince of darkness. We all know this. No one denies it, but the duties arising from our position and prospects—the issues the stupendous issues involved in death, are often lightly thought of or forgotten. It is well therefore to remind ourselves of the solemn truth that, "There is but a step between us and death."

Within the past few days this truth has been forced on everyone's attention with most distressed emphasis. One has been taken from our midst, whose removal is a national loss which has filled every Englishman's heart with sorrow—even beyond the limits of the empire but one feeling prevails. Universal regret that death has claimed such tribute from us of his power and presence. It is indeed most grievous. Nor is it alone the very sudden and fatal illness of the Duke of Clarence, reading to all such a solemn lesson on life's uncertainty, that makes us sad. His high position, as heir in succession to the throne of England, his prospects of usefulness, his gentle character, his charming disposition, his hope of marriage so near fulfilment, to one chosen, not from political or State necessity, but from the dictate of pure and simple affection, these are elements which embitter grief and are not to be excluded in estimating the magnitude of the loss we have, by the ordering of Divine providence, sustained. We know that in the ordinary course of nature, as it is called, the aged and infirm must pass away. But, when the young, surrounded by every safeguard against illness that human skill can desire, the young too of great promise, with every bright prospect of earthly happiness within their grasp, are snatched away almost without warning from their place among the living to be registered with the dead, it startles, it shocks our feelings. In wondering awe we exclaim, "Is it, can it be true?" But regret is vain. "There is but a step between death and the most exalted as well as the most humble."

Our sympathy to-day is not with the departed Prince. He is passed into a state of existence where such emotion is unavailing perhaps unneeded. He has entered let us hope into rest—rest in the Lord, and he waits not for an earthly crown, but the "crown of life" to be bestowed at the last day upon him by the King of kings, Christ

Jesus our Lord. Our sympathy is rather with the living—with the Royal parents, with our beloved and venerable Sovereign the Queen, stricken once more in declining years with such a blow—with the sweet and youthful bride-elect. Alas! her cup of earthly happiness full to overflowing is now exchanged for a potion bitter indeed.

With these and for these, one and all, our hearts ache, and pour forth a stream of full deep strong sympathy. For them our prayer should go up to the "Father of mercies, the God of all consolation," that He would grant them that aid and support which their necessities require. For ourselves we will pray that grace may be granted to us to profit by the lesson, so sharply, so imperatively brought to notice that there is "but a step between us and death."

Not for want of knowledge or warning is that lesson ever forgotten or overlooked. The interchange of day and night, of the seasons of the year, the decay of our own bodily strength when the step loses elasticity, the eye its power of vision, the prevailing sickness and mortality, all these remind us of an "end"—an end coming to ourselves. Who can tell how near it may be? Many graves ere the year runs out have to receive their occupants. Who can say that his own is not prepared or preparing? "Man cometh up and is cut down, he fleeth as it were a shadow, and never continueth in one stay. Between him and death there is 'but a step.'"

This being so, death is a wholesome subject for meditation. We are apt to take life as an inalienable possession. Some act as though they were born into the world only to make money, or spend what others left them. They are bent on self-indulgence or amusement. Pleasure rules even their form of religion, they cannot worship God unless a fine service attract them to His house, and please their ear while they listen to His praise. Sensationalism which is a kind of sensuality is creeping or has crept even into holy things. As a rule men are not content with what is plain and simple and true and therefore wholesome. All must be seasoned and spiced—made smart, externally beautiful, as though the senses and sensations were objects of worship and they themselves eternal.

Such folly needs the rebuke of death. The duty of life here, is to prepare for life hereafter. The dividing line between the two stages of existence is but a step. In an instant the scholar may have to lay down his pen, the rich to leave their wealth, the poor their poverty, the master his home, the servant his situation. Everyone is always at the point of death. From the moment of birth all without distinction, walk steadily towards their grave. No one can say when, where, or under what circumstances through accident, through sudden or lingering sickness he will depart hence. At each moment of existence in the body he may truly say: "there is but a step between me and death."

This is obvious commonplace truth, and for that very reason perhaps often neglected and forgotten. It may be that as a nation we have forgotten it, and that this great national affliction, which has filled all hearts with grief, is God's call to England to consider her ways before Him.

If it be asked wherein should our country consider her ways? Are we worse than other countries? or worse than our fathers? To such inquiries the answer may be given, that we are not to compare ourselves with others, but to consider whether each one in his vocation and position is walking humbly before God in righteousness and holiness.

When we consider the desecration of God's day of holy rest, by all classes, the Sunday bands of music—the Sunday parties and excursions—the universal greed for money, the condition of the poor, their murmuring, their strikes, their wretched habitations in the midst of untold wealth, the spirit of grabbing that infects men, women and children, the quiet disregard if not hostile opposition to religion and religious principle which is not confined to one section of society, it needs no great power of perception to see that the tone of public morals is low, that England is not what she ought to be and what she would be before God and man, if every Englishman did his duty in the conviction that there is between him and death, with its unknown issues, but one little step.

Death and the dead speak to us with eloquence and power, if we give ear to their discourse. And what is their message? What do the departed declare? Carry back your thoughts to the death-bed and burial of any you knew and loved on earth. You remember the last illness; the ebbing away of life; the weakness, the eyes at last closing never to behold you here again. Did not a voice within you then cry, and did not your own spirit re-echo its truth—"All flesh is grass and all the goodliness thereof as the flower of the field, the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand for ever." However fair in person, exalted in station, cultured in mind, however honourable prosperous and beloved you saw an end—the end awaiting all so far as this life is concerned. And you felt the vanity of earthly things, you acknowledged the folly and madness of neglecting those which are eternal.

Have you forgotten those thoughts and impressions? Do you not remember that you admitted the truth of the words, "Now is the accepted time now is the day of salvation." You learned what every death proclaims that here we have no abiding city, that all is transitory, uncertain, passing away from us, or we from it.

Upon your recollection of that lesson and upon your mode of carrying it out, depends your own future, when you cross the narrow boundary be-

tween you and death. To those who can honestly say—"To me to live is Christ"—death is gain. They may give up their soul to God in peace and feel no fear. Christ is their life—Christ their peace.

But what can we say for others, those who have lived only for time and sense and have not set God before their eyes? If having done all that is commanded we are yet unprofitable, and shall feel that it is so at the last, what can they expect, who have done everything that is forbidden? Death is a dark valley—and the Judgment Seat of God an awful reality. And though they who depart hence in Christ need fear no ill, doubtless even the holiest saint will feel how utterly insignificant has been their service, as a service of love and devotion to Him who loved them and gave His life for their redemption. The very nearness of their realised hopes, and of Him who is the Author of their salvation will sober them in the joy of their faith. The reason is plain, they have died daily. They have known the power of Divine grace leading them and how imperfectly they have followed. Yet they need not fear. One has borne their infirmities who will be with them as a sure refuge and support.

But do not presume on Divine mercy. Do not forget that if we have not religion before sickness and the end come, it may be too late to seek it. Sickness is not the time for seeking God: some kinds exclude the possibility of doing so. In great pain or stupor, mental and spiritual energy may be crushed, so that the soul would appear before God without final preparatory prayer. Who would desire such an end? Who would not pray against it.

The uncertainty then of life, the nearness of death, the sad illustration of that nearness which we have just witnessed and which casts its shadow over every heart and home this day throughout the length and breadth of the land—these things surely call upon us old and young alike, as with a voice from God himself, to consider our ways, to repent of past sins, to be more diligent more earnest in running the race set before us, less eager in our pursuit of earthly treasure, more anxious to lay up treasure in heaven.

When that supreme moment arrives in which "this mortal will put on immortality," it will matter nothing whether we have been here reckoned among the rich or poor, the great and noble, or the humble and obscure, but it will make an infinite difference whether we have done or left undone the will of our Father in heaven—whether we have followed Christ or trampled His blood under foot, whether we have no more to bring into His presence for judgment than a soul and body contaminated and worn out by service to sin and Satan.

May God grant us grace to profit by His forebearance and mercy, Who has spared us in this time of sickness and public sorrow. May we also live to His glory, and love each other in Him now in the time of this mortal life, that when we take the dividing step between time and eternity we may be admitted into His everlasting kingdom, and glory and dwelling, with the spirits of the just made perfect in Christ Jesus our Lord, share with them the blessedness of the Church Triumphant.

It is propo ed to form a committee to take steps for placing a bust or other memorial of the late Professor C. Adams in Westminster Abbey. Among those who have consented to join the committee are the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the representatives of the University in Parliament, the President of the Royal Society, the Astronomer Royal, the Provost of Trinity, Dublin, the Masters of Trinity, Caius, and Pembroke, and Professor Cayley.

Canon Christopher gave on Saturday, the 13th inst., his annual missionary breakfast at the Clarendon Hotel. It was attended by almost more than the usual number both of graduates and undergraduates. The speaker this year was the Bishop of Exeter, who gave an interesting account of his recent experience and observations in Japan. The picture he presented of the work being done there was of the most encouraging kind. In spreading education among both men and women, in parochial or quasi-parochial visitation, in missionary preaching, the Bishop and his clergy seem to be doing truly excellent work; but as in India, so in Japan we should gather that it is through education that the most permanent work is done, and the most satisfactory results obtained.

The Council of Mansfield College, Oxford, has made arrangements for a short summer session in 1892. Various courses of lectures will be delivered, designed to meet the wants of men who feel that the ordinary work of the ministry has not allowed them to keep abreast of the later inquiries and discussions in the field of theology. The lectures will extend from July 18th to 30th. It is intended that the lectures, in the main, be delivered in the mornings, that the afternoons should be free for recreation or other private purposes, and that in the evenings informal conferences should be held on theological, religious, and ministerial questions. The provisional programme of courses of lectures to be delivered includes the names of Canon Driver; Dr. Francis Brown, of New York; Dr. Marcus Dods, of Edinburgh; Mr. Massie; Professor Sanday; Principal Edwards, of Bala; Professor Bruce, of Glasgow; Principal Cave; and Dr. Fairbairn.

The Bishop of Rochester, in a letter commending to the diocese the new series of the *Diocesan Chronicle*, says:—"In the conditions of modern days, in our diocese at least, a diocesan chronicle seems an almost essential part of the machinery of a National Church. To the Bishop of the diocese, and to the Bishop-Suffragan it must obviously be of incalculable service to have an agency through which public engagements and appointments become immediately known in every parish, and the gain is scarcely less to every diocesan officer, lay or clerical, whose responsibilities extend beyond his own immediate neighbourhood. Such a publication ought to kill the foolish and ignorant notion that what is going on in the diocese is a matter that only concerns the clergy.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1892.

THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

OF the din of platform oratory—save the mark!—there seems never to be an end in London, and the voice of prudence and common sense seems hushed for ever amid the brazen clangour of quacks and quackery. The present time is a period of upheaval, at which every fad, folly, and perversity of which the human mind is capable is tossed up to the top, and seems likely to stay there. We hope they will not stay much longer in the London County Council. No doubt the Council meant well, and no doubt people expected too much of it, but the fact will be recorded in history that the members of the first London Parliament succeeded in little else but discrediting themselves and disappointing their constituencies. When it comes to tracing tendencies the County Council is all right, it appears as a body of philanthropic individuals, without much sense of dignity and without any sense of humour, who were actuated by general principles of charity and loving-kindness (especially at other people's expense), and were not hampered by anything of the nature of business habits or attention to the details of the particular functions which they were called upon to perform. These estimable gentlemen would have made very decent crusaders; they have mostly proved execrable councillors; but they will have achieved something if they have succeeded, as seems probable, in impressing upon the electors the type of man to be avoided for the future in municipal elections. We admire their genuine philanthropy, and we respect their estimable, though eccentric, principles, but we disapprove of their unbusiness-like conduct of municipal affairs, and their chronic habit of introducing fifty different King Charles' heads into every discussion, which dragged its slow length along while work was waiting to be done. We are weary of their loquacity and disgusted with their intolerance, we are anxious to bid them farewell and welcome their successors.

THE REV. DR. DONALD FRASER, D.D.

ANOTHER great preacher has gone to his rest, and another famous and familiar figure has passed from the gaze of London folk. Dr. Fraser for twenty years stood in the first rank of London clergymen, and he was no less brilliant with the pen than in the pulpit: it would be difficult to estimate the number of hearers and readers his words have reached during the last quarter of a century. Originally designed for a business career he entered the ministry of his own free will because he felt the urgent need the Scotch settlers in Canada had of pastors of their own race and way of thinking, and the work he so nobly began he carried on as nobly to its close. Like Spurgeon he was famous almost from the first. After much successful work abroad he enjoyed the rare distinction of being called back to take charge of his own native parish, and finally he was summoned to the most important Presbyterian Church in the metropolis. His success was assured at the outset, and very soon the spacious and ornate church now so familiar in Marylebone replaced the original somewhat dingy building. Donald Fraser was severely orthodox, firm in conviction, and clear and precise in expression. He had not the peculiar gifts which made Spurgeon so great a leader in Israel, but he was second to none among his own people, and his acute insight, sound learning, and clear and accurate style made his sermons and articles valuable to many classes of persons to whom Spurgeon would scarcely have appealed at all. He was a philosopher and man of letters as well as a preacher, and a great part of his work will probably endure. His congregation will not easily replace him, especially under the present circumstances of their church. There is no debt upon the building. Dr. Fraser's great powers not only sufficed to gather twenty odd thousand pounds to pay for that, but kept the general receipts up to some £2,600 a year; yet in spite of all that there is at present a deficit—*hiatus valde deflendus* of some £1,300—and a yearly rent to pay of £430. Even with a Donald Fraser at their head were the Presbyterians of Marylebone wise to incur such liabilities? They are serious responsibilities, not to say obstacles, for his successor.

THE PARISH AND THE PARSON.

THE vicar of Kingston Vale has announced to a crowded congregation that his parishioners have

driven him out of his parish. The good man has not been induced to take this course by the apathy of his flock—quite the reverse. *Point de zèle* is his motto, and he finds them too zealous. They are "forward in good works"—in fact, a good deal too forward, and the vicar's complaint is that all the work is done in the parish before he ever gets to know of it; they do the things first and tell him afterwards. We always deplore these parochial squabbles, but we cannot sympathise with the vicar of Kingston Vale, his complaint is so undignified. He finds himself in a dilemma, he says, for if he disagrees with the pious plans which have been made without his knowledge he seems to be out of harmony with his parishoners, and if he agrees he seems a mere tool in their hands. Cannot the vicar see that the intrinsic merit of the plans is the main point, not who thought of them first? On the vicar's own showing there are plenty of good people in the parish who ought to be a tower of strength to a man of character and influence. No doubt it is awkward for the sheep to assume the lead, but whenever they do we are inclined to suspect the fault lies with the shepherd.

WILLIAM REEVES, LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

The "Prayer Book" Churchman.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, D.D., Rector of Warrenpoint, Author of "The Church of St. Patrick," "Ireland since the Reformation," "Ireland since the Union," etc.

(*Continued from page* 81.)

II.

Bishop Mant at this time presided over Down and Connor, and the work was fitly dedicated in these terms: "The following pages are inscribed to the Right Reverend Prelate, whose life and doctrine with his learning have renewed to Down and Connor with Dromore the happy union which existed when his lordship's illustrious predecessor, Jeremy Taylor, embraced the same dioceses in his jurisdiction, and exemplified the same excellencies in his character." The details of the taxation, known as "the Tenths" of 1306, have been preserved, and are the most ancient collection of ecclesiastical statistics connected with Ireland (apart from that of the churches of St. Patrick and Holy Trinity, Dublin, dated 1294), now remaining. The rolls were discovered in 1807 by Mr. Vanderzee, a sub-commissioner of English Records, in the office of the Remembrancer of His Majesty's Exchequer at Westminster, whither they had been removed in 1323. The research and scholarship, exhibited by Dr. Reeves in this work, are simply astounding, especially when we read in the Introduction, page 23, "It has been put together under great disadvantages, a hundred miles from Dublin, and in the midst of parochial engagements which allowed of only occasional snatches for making the necessary enquiries. But the kindness of friends enabled the compiler to turn his time to the best account, and to those friends his warmest thanks are due." The well-known names of the Rev. James Henthorn Todd and John O'Donovan are mentioned among the friends referred to. The appendix supplies information on points which only come within the author's scope incidentally, besides containing valuable ecclesiastical and topographical details; as an illustration of the first-class, we may cite the lucid account given by the writer as to the much discussed question of primitive episcopacy in the Church of Ireland. "A moderate acquaintance," says the author, "with the ancient ecclesiastical records of the island is sufficient to impress the mind with the conviction that episcopal ordination was very frequent in the primitive Church of Ireland, and that in raising ministers to the office of Bishop, respect was rather had to their qualifications in piety, learning, and zeal than to the claims of the district over which they were placed: it being more the object to secure to the Church the perpetuity of Orders than to parcel it out into accurately defined dioceses." This frequency of Bishops he attributes to various causes—(1) The rapid progress of Christianity in the island, the number of converts making supervision necessary.; (2) The state of civil affairs, there being many petty principalities under two chief confederacies; (3) The prevalence of Chorepiscopi in the early Celtic Church, who were country bishops answering to our rural deans; (4) The custom of combining the Episcopal and Abbatial offices in the founders or heads of religious houses. It is to this last cause he attributes the number of unbeneficed Irish bishops, who visited England and the Continent in those early ages. On the whole this work represented an amount of learning, industry and research, which at once placed the author in the very front rank of Irish archæologists, and his subsequent writings served to maintain for him that high reputation. It was characteristic of our departed diocesan that when he became a Bishop he bought up all the copies of this book that came in his way, and presented them to such of his own clergy as he thought likely to value the gift. This book was followed by another in 1850, "Acts of Archbishop Colton in his Metropolitan Visitation of the diocese of Derry, A.D. 1397, with the Rental of the See Estates at that time."

This valuable addition to our annals was printed at the sole expense of the editor, Dr. Reeves, and the edition was presented to the Irish Archæological Society for distribution among the members, an act of generosity on the part of a struggling curate, not usual at least in Ireland. Colton was an Englishman who, having been Lord Treasurer, was created Lord Chancellor of Ireland in 1379, and by a Bull of Urban II. appointed Primate in 1382. He began his visitation of Derry on October 8th, 1396, accompanied by his chaplains and by Richard Kenmore, a clerk of the diocese of Meath, and public notary. And as his object was to establish a precedent, the acts were carefully noted and subsequently preserved in the Record Room of the See of Armagh. Dr. Reeves draws attention in the Preface to the existence of two churches in Ireland. One, inter Anglicos, the Church of the English Pale, wherein the Primate claimed the spiritualities only, the temporalites belonging to the Crown; the other amongst the Irishrie inter Hibernicos, where he claimed both spiritualities and temporalities.

The coexistence side by side of two Churches in Ireland is one of the most important facts in our

annals dating from the Danish occupation, when in 1074 A.D. Patrick had been consecrated for the see of Dublin by Lanfranc. In addition to the value of this work as a side-light on the condition of the Irish Church five hundred years ago it possesses additional value from the vast stores of useful information collected by the editor. Rev. Robert King, author of the "Church History of Ireland," notes the appearance of the publication in the Appendix, vol. iii., p. 1063, where he adds that it "contains much important information on the subject of *corbey* and *erenachs* and of Irish Church revenues in general." And here in passing we may mention that Dr. Reeves warns us not to confound the office of the *erenach* with that of the archdeacon. The former was generally a layman who held lands on the tenure of supplying the bishop with provisions and necessaries. He was "the chief man" over the temporalities of the see; *corbe* or *coarb* means "successor." It is very suggestive of the times that at Ardstraw the *erenachs*, as one of their duties, set watchmen round the town for the protection of the Primate. Here, too, occurred a ceremony not altogether unknown even in our days, for on October 9th, 1396, the Primate *reconciled* the churchyard, where a murder had polluted it. In the "Antiquities," p. 123, the author dwells on the care taken by the early Celtic Church to secure perpetuity of Orders, and in this connection the following extract, referring to the Elizabethan period, is of interest, and may fitly be inserted here. On June 29, 1889, in reply to the question, "What effect on our succession has the absence of attesting signatures of consecrators from the Registers recording the consecration of certain Irish bishops?" he replied thus:—"The omission exists, but does not in any way affect our Succession or the validity of our Orders. The due consecration of Bishops has always been regarded as of essential importance, and we have good reason to believe that those charged at that time with the oversight of such matters so regarded it. At this distance of time documentary evidence in each case cannot be produced, but it is morally certain that all things were done decently and in order. The burden of proof, moreover, does not rest with those in possession, but with those who dispute the claim." It would be outside the scope of my sketch to dwell on all the literary work performed by Dr. Reeves, but I cannot omit mention of his most valuable production, "Adamnan's Life of St. Columba, 1857": *facile princeps* among the editions of the life of the great missionary of the early Celtic Church. In this same year he was appointed Vicar of Lusk in the diocese of Dublin, which post he held until 1865, and where he published in 1864 "The Culdees of the British Islands." In Charles' Directory, this being the first year of that valuable publication, I find in the same year, 1862, William Reeves returned as Librarian of Armagh. He was appointed one of the Vicars Choral of Armagh in 1862, and in 1865 became rector of Tynan. The energy of the man seems marvellous. He published, in addition to those works, already enumerated, "The Ancient Churches of Armagh"; "St. Maelrubha: his History and Churches;" "The Book of Common Prayer according to the use of the Church of Ireland: its History and Sanction," 1871; "Historical and Descriptive Memoir of St. Patrick's Bell," 1877. His name figures extensively in the proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy during the past half century, and he was a frequent contributor to the "Ulster Journal of Archæology," the "Journal of the Royal Historical and Archæological Association of Ireland," and the "Irish Ecclesiastical Journal." For years he acted as secretary to the Royal Irish Academy, and the indexing of their proceedings was mainly his work. He was elected M.R.I.A. 1846, Vice-president 1882, President 1891. He edited and indexed vol. xviii. of the works of Ussher, and devoted much time and labour to the task of deciphering the Book of Armagh, and recently had in view an edition of the works of his predecessor, Jeremy Taylor. And all this time he was ready to help in every way the most humble seeker after knowledge, as well as to contribute his aid to such writers as Rev. Robert King, author of the "Church History of Ireland," who says, in the appendix to that work, vol. iii., p 114: "For the document here subjoined I am indebted to my valued friend, the reverend, learned, and industrious William Reeves, D.D., who furnished me with a copy of the original transcribed by himself."

Again and again in Preface after Preface of books written by eminent men occurs this same acknowledgment of help sought for and cheerfully given. The Right Hon. Dr. Ball refers to it, "Reformed Church of Ireland," Appendix, p. 312: "Alfred Webb, Author of a Compendium of Irish Biography," Dublin. M. H. Gill, 1878, has a similar reference, while Mr. Shirley, in his History of the County of Monaghan, closes his Preface with thanks to "his dear friend, the Very Rev. the Dean of Armagh, the most accurate as well as the most erudite ecclesiastical authority in Ireland." And at the same time he was in constant touch with learned Societies, writing for them and writing well, while he had also as Dean of Armagh the Services of the Cathedral, and in later years the charge of a diocese, and previously the care of a parish, in which he gained the affection of his people, and literally, not figuratively, held the cure of souls, concerned for the well-being of his flock, loving and caring for his people, visiting, catechizing, and preaching; in parochial and subsequently in diocesan as in literary work, unostentatious, quiet, unobtrusive, but observant and attentive; too zealous for the honour of his Master to neglect any known duty, too sensitive as to the dignity of his office to disregard its smallest details, or to perform in a slovenly or perfunctory manner any of its functions. But, in addition to the duties which devolved on Dr. Reeves in connection with the cures held by him at various times and the literary work already referred to he found an outlet for his energy in other directions. In 1847 he was Examining Chaplain to Bishop Mant, in 1849 Diocesan Schoolmaster, Chaplain to his Grace the Lord Primate in 1868. In 1860 the University of Edinburgh conferred on him the degree LL.D. for special erudition, an example followed by that of Dublin in 1871: he was therefore at the time of his death possessor of a Doctor's Degree in three distinct courses, a bishop of the Church of Ireland, an honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and President of the Royal Irish Academy. Before passing on from this part of Dr. Reeves's career I select one specimen out of many to show the esteem in which he was held by those who knew him best, and who could perhaps alone estimate fully the powers of his rare intellect.

At a general meeting of the Royal Irish Academy, Dr. Ingram presiding, Rev. Dr. Salmon, Provost of Trinity College, proposed the following resolution:—"That the Academy desires, at this, its first meeting since the lamented decease of its late president, Dr. Reeves, the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, to express its deep sense of the loss sustained by his

death, and to convey to Mrs. Reeves and the members of his family their earnest sympathy and condolence." He said that this was the second occasion on which the Academy was placed in mourning by the death of its president. It seems but the other day that they were mourning for Sir Samuel Ferguson, and now they had lost another president, who had completed an entire year of office. This claim to propose a tribute to the memory of Dr. Reeves did not rest on the ground of friendship alone, for the kindly dispositions and the genial manners of their late president had won him such hosts of friends, that he (the Provost) could not claim an exclusive prerogative to move the tribute to his memory. But as a very old member of the Academy he had a claim to move this tribute to the memory of another very old member. Dr. Reeves had been elected to the Academy in 1846, while he (the Provost) became a member in 1843, and thus both could claim to have been connected with the institution for a very long time. Their late president always took a lively interest in the Academy; he gave it many of the best years of his work, contributing largely to their proceedings and transactions; and as an officer of the Academy in which he had won his way to the highest post, no one was better known to the outside world than the late Bishop of Down, and he had established a strong claim on their gratitude by the assiduous work which he did for the Academy. He was occupied as their secretary for many years, and in that position he had effected many reforms. The indexing of their proceedings was, in a great measure, his work. It was a matter of congratulation to them that before he died he had received the honour of being made their president. His life, perhaps, had been shortened by the continuous journeys to and from Dublin; but his greatest delight and pleasure had been to participate in their meetings. They would find it very hard to replace him by one more generally esteemed, respected, and loved.

The resolution was seconded by the Rev. Dr. Delaney, S.J., who said he deemed it an honour to express concurrence with the expressions of regret from the Academy at the loss sustained by the death of Dr. Reeves.

One who knew Dr. Reeves well says of him :—"At the time when he was Vicar Choral and Prebendary before the Disestablishment, he was one of the sweetest tempered and gentlest men I ever met. He was not much thought of in those days as a preacher, though his sermons were always good, sensible discourses. He kept closely to the manuscript, and I never remember seeing him lift his eyes from the book while preaching. He was fond of music, but was not a practical musician; he was then a man of singularly fine presence, his real forte was literary work; he was much more at home in the library of Armagh than in the cathedral. At the same time he attended to his duties in the cathedral, on much the same principle I fancy that he accepted a bishopric when he was elected, not because he liked the work or would have selected it, but because being his duty he thought it ought to be done. He seemed to attach great importance always to *duty*."

From a parishioner at Tynan comes this tribute :—"We were so delighted when Dr. Reeves was appointed Bishop, but at the same time we were sorry, for he had been more like a father to us when we wanted a friend than anything else."

"Everybody loved Dr. Reeves," says one who knew him in Armagh, and the tribute is worth quoting for its hard Northern quaintness, "but though he was such a clever man he was so much wrapped up in his books he was *a wee bit too simple* about them, and, for the matter of that, about old curiosities of all sorts. Why, if an old woman in the country found some old fossil or any old rubbish of that kind, she'd run off to the Library to show it to '*the Dane*.'"

In 1868 the Church Congress met at Dublin under circumstances of peculiar interest. Disestablishment was in the air. Change was impending and none could tell what the future had in store for the Church. The list of names is enough to stir the pulses even yet: Magee and Trench, Salmon, Alexander, Jellett, Reichel, Plunket, Reeves, Dickinson, Lee, represented the Church of Ireland, and there was a widespread impression that her sons did no dishonour to their mother Church.

The question of questions was that of Lay agency, and Dr. Reeves read a paper before the Congress which gives us the key to his opinions as to this subject before Disestablishment. That he should have sought the foundation for his views in the past rather than in the possible requirements of the future, was also in keeping with the strict conservatism one would naturally expect from the man. He starts by indicating that in early Irish Synods the laity had a place, and that the character of the Synod does not become strictly clerical until the 12th century under Papal influence.

The following extract expresses his main position :

"The question of revival of Convocation in Ireland, which has of late gained possession of the public mind, is one full of interest and importance. As far as I can judge the great, the overwhelming weight of Church opinion is in its favour. Commencing from our revered Primate and descending through the various grades of our order, both among the practical and enthusiastic, the investigator and the borrower, the theorist and common sense man, there is a longing for the privileges of olden times. Multitudes who know nothing of convocation but the name, and have a very confused idea of clerical representation, still feel that the Church is in bondage, and that the strait waistcoat that was put on in 1714—though possibly required for the passing moment—has been allowed to remain unchanged too long, and that this century pays too dearly for the errors or eccentricities of the past. Some as we have heard on Tuesday in this hall, not only desire ancient liberty and revived action but demand a reconstruction of the old system. But to such it may be said that the body, to be reformed or readjusted, must first be called into existence, and that after this it will be time enough to consider the expediency or the measures of its improvement.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." February, 1892. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

PROFESSOR CHEYNE'S paper on Dr. Driver's now famous "Introduction" is one that we can only say we have read with great pain. Not only is its tone the very height of arrogant self conceit, the conservative theologian being treated with all that smiling, condescending patronage which ill-bred, half knowledge only can display; but the reading of so

much German Rationalism has had a very bad effect on the Professor's notions of morality. We have read his account of the famous finding of the book of the law in the house of the Lord with shame and indignation. Not only was the whole transaction a pious fraud, Hilkiah only professed to find it; but—the more irreverently we seem to put it, the less irreverent we shall really be—the Almighty was a consenting party. "One of those seeming chances," says Professor Cheyne, "which mark the interposing hand of God favoured the project of Hilkiah. Repairs on a large scale had been undertaken in the Temple, and with his mind set on the restoration of the material house of God, Josiah was all the more likely to be interested in the re-edification of His spiritual house. So Shaphan reported the finding, and read the book in the ears of the king." A pious fraud may seem to be the most natural way of "re-edifying" the spiritual house of God to a German Rationalist, but we venture to think the common honesty of Mr. Matthew Arnold's friend the "plain man" will say it was a dodge, too dirty even for a politician, and that is saying a good deal. Professor Cheyne seems to have some glimmering idea of this, for he adds: "If any one calls this a falsehood must he not at least admit that it is defensible on the same principle by which Plato defends certain select legendary tales, etc." We can assure Professor Cheyne that a very learned gentleman in ermine representing Her Majesty, and twelve men in ordinary attire representing the nation, would make uncommonly short work of such a defence in a court of Law. Professor Cheyne proposes somewhere in the paper that a manual be made for students, setting forth the results of this higher criticism falsely so called: we should rather recommend the total disuse of the Bible altogether, for the reading of a large volume of pious frauds is most unwholesome; hoeing potatoes is far better employment.

After Professor Cheyne, it is a relief to turn to any of the other four papers. Professor Agar Beet examines the Doctrine of the Atonement in the Johannean writings. He sees a type of teaching "differing widely in phraseology and modes of thought from that of the Synoptist Gospels," but the underlying idea is the same.

The other papers are Dean Chadwick on the Miracles, and Mr. G. A. Smith on the Historical Geography of the Holy Land.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"IS THERE A PURGATORY?"

SIR,—The unreasonable, arrogant, and unseemly style of the letters signed "R. Donaldson" does not appear to become modified or amended. The writer seems to assume as an incontrovertible proposition, that an assertion of his, unsupported by the shadow of argument, and opposed to self-evident facts, or even to his own previous statements, ought to be hailed with the respectful assent of all the world. There is something almost tending to facetiousness in the advice given by this writer to "Vicar." If modesty is a fault to be condemned, almost every one must pronounce him free from the taint of such a quality. He says, *on his own authority and without proofs*, that the Bishop of Manchester "is wrong," yet he is greatly shocked at what he calls "the arrogant assumption of self-constituted authority," in one of your contributors who, I presume, has more knowledge, good sense and fairmindedness than have fallen to his own share. Nothing is more comical than the notions he manifests about "wholesome words of truth and soberness."

My chief object in writing is to advocate the views which I believe to be scriptural, bright, consolatory, and salutary. There are some remarks in the letter referred to about the definite and indefinite meaning of the word eternal. In an interesting book by an American writer, Rev. Dr. Edward Beecher, the meaning of *aion* and *aionios* as shown in Greek writers from early periods, is fully entered into. Primarily life, a living spirit; then duration, indefinite so far as the word itself indicated, but defined by the context. When applied to God the idea of endlessness is derived from Him, not from the word.

The writer of the letter referred to, inquires why we should say that *aionios* means endless when applied to the life of the blessed, and not when applied to sin and misery in a future life? I venture to reply, because we have abundant texts to prove it. Among them are: "Because I live ye shall live also. Life and immortality are brought to light by the Gospel." That is on one side. Then on the other, "The Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. Having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself."

We have also our moral consciousness strongly urging the same views on us. If in this life I feel compassion for those who suffer, and an earnest desire that sin may be removed, and that all minds and hearts may be under the sway of light and love, I find it impossible to suppose that I shall view anguish and depravity with calm serenity in a future life. If with my imperfect and limited faculties on earth, I employ my best efforts against evil of every kind, it appears preposterous to doubt that those who are "a kind of first-fruits of God's creatures," and who are evidently being prepared for important services, will actively engage in the most important work that can be conceived.

J. B.

Canonbury, February 13th, 1892.

SIR,—I have read Dr. Donaldson's letter in the PULPIT of the 13th, and thank him for the extract from Liddell and Scott, stating that ἀεὶ and αἰὼν are kindred words, being both from the root AIF, which is not now found in Greek, but remains in Latin, in the form *ævum*. This is not in the edition of the Lexicon which I consulted. But, though I am aware that I am no authority on the Greek language, I believe any scholar will confirm the statement that αἰὼν cannot have been formed by the mere coalescence of the two words ἀεὶ and ὤν.

It remains true, however, as Mr. Lawrence remarks in the PULPIT of the 6th February, that the etymology of a word cannot generally be relied on to fix its meaning.

Dr. Donaldson asks of me a definite answer to the question: "How I know that in the discourse recorded in Matt. xxv. 46, the Saviour meant differently, that the people to whom He spoke understood Him to mean differently, and that we are obliged to understand Him differently," when He used the word eternal

in its two connections? I do not assert this. I say that the question of finite, or absolutely infinite duration, is not raised there. The word is indefinite, and if any further light can be obtained on its meaning from Scripture, it must be from other passages. Dr. Donaldson asserts that *αἰώνιος* necessarily denotes infinite duration, either in the future or in the past. Now *αἰώνιος* is admitted to be an immediate derivative of *αἰών*, and *αἰών*, in those places where it is translated *world* (see Matt. xiii. 39 and xxviii. 20, also Heb. i. 2) can only mean the finite time between the beginning and the end of the world.

The rest of Dr. Donaldson's reply to me appears to be already replied to in my letter in the PULPIT of the 30th January, and I see no use in repeating the same things over again. I must, however, remind your readers that where Dives "lifted up his eyes in hell," the original has not Gehenna but Hades. Whatever these words mean, it is not likely that the difference between them is unimportant.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, February 14th, 1892.

FAITH AS A PRINCIPLE OF ACTION.

SIR,—There are three senses in which the word "faith" may be, and is, used. (1) It is the name of a distinct faculty. (2) It describes that faculty in action. (3) It is used for the facts on which the faculty operates.

(1) "Faith is the gift of God," and as such is as distinct from reason, and as far above it as reason is distinct and far above instinct.

(2) This is not a distinction without a difference, any more than is sight and the eye. "Eye" is the name of the organ, "Sight" is the name of action of the organ.

(3) The facts on which faith, as a faculty, operates, are those of revelation—things done, "things hoped for, things unseen."

Now this distinction between the senses in which the word "faith" is taken is not often made, and so a great deal of confusion of thought arises, and "we do not distinguish between things that differ." The worst is, that men too often try to apprehend by reason that which can only be apprehended by faith. See this illustrated by supposing a man trying to apprehend by the sense of hearing what is only to be apprehended by smelling.

I throw out these remarks with two objects—(1) To solicit further opinions on the points. (2) To show the "higher critics" the faculty they should bring to bear on the truths of the Bible.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, February 13th, 1892.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS

Balfour, Rev. C. L.; Vicar of Aston Blank, Gloucestershire.
Bardsley, Rev. S. M., M.A.; Vicar of Christ Church, Rotherhithe.
Barker, Rev. Herbert Arthur, B.A.; Vicar of Wrangle, Boston.
Blackmore, Rev. W., M.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Augustine's, Grove-park, Lee.
Bower, Rev. R., Vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Carlisle; Chaplain to the 1st Cumberland Artillery Volunteers.
Brack, Rev. Martin, M.A.; Chaplain at Christiania.
Chichester, Rev. Edward Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Dorking; Rural Dean of Dorking.
Dalton, Rev. Canon John Neale, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, and Canon of St. George's, Windsor; Honorary Chaplain to Prince George of Wales.
Davies, Rev. H. C., M.A., Senior Curate of Penarth; Rector of St. Hilary, near Cowbridge.
Davies, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Curate of Glyntaff, Treforest; Rector of Henllys with Bettws, Monmouthshire.
Fleming, Rev. Canon, D.D., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Residentiary Canon of York, and Vicar of St. Michael's, Chester-square; Honorary Chaplain to the Prince of Wales.
Gascoigne, Rev. William Birch, M.A.; Rector of Bucknell, Oxon.
Grinstead, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Brentwood; Rural Dean of Barstable.
Hichens, Rev. Baron, M.A., Rector of Ottershaw; Rural Dean of Emly.
Hone, Rev. Evelyn, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Deptford; Rural Dean of Greenwich.
Hoste, Rev. James Richard Philip, B.A., Rector of Farnham, and Honorary Canon of Winchester; Rural Dean of Farnham.
Klamborowski, Rev. Leonard; Rector of Barnston, Essex.
Lang, Rev. Robert, M.A., Secretary of the Church Missionary Society; Vicar of Old Warden, Biggleswade.
Micklethwaite, Rev. A. J., M.A., Chaplain of the House of Mercy, Horbury; Vicar of St. Luke's, Cambridge
Middleton, Rev. Frederick Mathews, M.A., Vicar of Yorktown; Rural Dean of Woking.
Musgrave, Rev. Vernon, M.A., Rector of Hascombe, and Honorary Canon of Winchester; Rural Dean of Godalming.
Paul, Rev. F. W., M.A., Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Nottingham; Rector of Lanivet, Cornwall.
Phillips, Rev. Frederick Parr, M.A.; Rural Dean of Leatherhead.
Rees, Rev. Leonard H., M.A.; Vicar of Kirkdale, Yorkshire.
Rivers, Rev. Arthur Frederic; Rector of Mundford, Norfolk.
Sanders, Rev. William Skipsey, M.A., Rector of St. Nicholas, Guildford; Rural Dean of Guildford.
Sharp, Rev. Arnold Mortimer, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew Kinson-cum-St. Mark, Talbot Village, Dorsetshire.
Sorby, Rev. A. E., M.A., Vicar of St. Jude's, Moorfields, Sheffield; Rector of Darfield, near Barnsley.
Southwell, Rev. Henry Kemble, M.A.; Rector of Chetton-with-Glazeley, Deuxhill, and Loughton, Salop.
Truscott, Rev. Howard J. H., late Curate-in-Charge of Eastnor, near Ledbury; Minister of the New District, and Vicar-designate of St. Catherine's, Hatcham-park, and Trotman Lecturer at All Hallows', Lombard-street.
Westcott, Rev. Frederick Brooke, M.A., Assistant-Master at Rugby School; Head Master of Sherborne School.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Clarke-Travers, Rev. H. A., at Costebelle, Hyères, on the 2nd inst., aged 43.
Curtis, Rev. Edward, Rector of the Parish, at Little Bytham Rectory, on the 7th inst., aged 53.
Gault, Rev. Archibald, B.A., at Marsham, Norwich, on the 11th inst., aged 65.
Harris, Rev. Joseph, eldest son of the late J. Harris, of Westcotes, Leicester, at Herm House, Eastbourne, on the 10th inst., aged 60.
Haworth, Rev. Henry, formerly Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bolton, at Bolton-le-Sands, on the 6th inst., aged 80.
Irwin, Rev. John Lewis, at Southampton, on the 5th inst., aged 83.
Lowther, Rev. Beresford, J.P., late Vicar of Vowchurch, of the Manor House, Wickham, at 28, Connaught-square, W., on the 7th inst., aged 82.
Oakley, Rev. George John Jocelyn, eldest son of the late Rev. G. R. Oakley, of Leicester, at 2, Leigh-villas, Kingston-road, Wimbledon, on the 11th inst.
Sherrard, Rev. H. W., at Stechford, on the 6th inst., aged 29.
Short, Rev. John Holbeche, at Temple Balsall, on the 7th inst., aged 80.
Swainson, Rev. John Houghton, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, on the 8th inst., aged 50.

The Church of England Pulpit.

FERVENT PRAYER.

By the Rev. WALTER LOCK, M.A., Keble College.

Sermon Preached at St. Mary's, Oxford.

"The effectual fervent p ayer of a righteous man availeth much."—St. James v. 16.

NOT long ago the Principal of a Theological College, who was accustomed to receive University graduates as his students, was asked the question—"What would you most like done for your students while at the Universities? How could they be best prepared here?" The answer was, "I think the chief thing which they want is to be taught how to pray." It was a startling and indeed humiliating answer to us. Those of us who are Christians—and of course it is only of such that he was speaking—fancied that we had been taught how to pray from our childhood; and yet, if it is true that "every prayer should become a real work of art, as it expresses our best feelings," then prayer will have its rules of art, its methods times, order, symmetry; and of course it must be true that the child's prayers will need very much expansion and deepening before they can be the worthy utterance of the man. To attempt to face the perplexities and difficulties of manhood with the mere child's prayers is like attempting to translate some difficult Greek author, with no other help than the glossary of a primer. I will venture, then, to say a few words on that one form of prayer of which my text speaks—of our prayers for others, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

The words of the Greek are far more expressive than this translation, *πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη*. A great force is the praying of a righteous man, in its activity, as it puts itself into action. Prayer is regarded as passing out from the lips and being condensed into deeds. In what ways can this be done?

Before we attempt to answer this question, let us remind ourselves that intercessory prayer is but one part of the great system of intercession on which human life is organised. Intercession—it is simply "a coming in between": we know the word well in Roman political history, as the tribune's veto. The Patricians propose some law that seems likely to injure the people: the tribune intercedes: he stands between the people and the threatened danger; and their rights are saved. Again, a great patrician general has become the object of the envy and ill-will of the populace: he is brought to trial: he is in danger of being banished from the country which he has saved. A Tiberius Gracchus intercedes, and Scipio Africanus is saved. In its widest sense it may be applied to every act in which one human being is able to come in between another and some evil that might befall him. Nay, we may extend it even more widely still to the whole principle of mediation, by which one man is used to convey blessings to another. You will remember the distinction which Bishop Butler draws upon this subject of mediation: on the one side he places the general notion of mediation—that is to say, the truth that the ordinary blessings of life, such as birth, health, nourishment, education, are all mediated to us through the agencies of others. On the other side there is the special notion of mediation, which is akin to our Lord's redemptive work; it is the further truth that, when a man's nature has been injured, when his body or his soul has suffered, then that injury can be to a certain extent repaired, that suffering set right, by the mediation of others, by the action of the physician or the friend. There are clear proofs of "what may be called mercy or compassion in the original constitution of this world": there is "room for an interposition to avert the fatal consequences of vice. Both of these methods of mediation are of common occurrence in daily life; both of them correspond to our Lord's work: the first mainly to His work as the Word of God in creation, the second to His work in His Incarnate Life. And because of this analogy, Butler explains the words "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son," with the bold comment, "gave His Son in the same way of goodness to the world as He affords particular persons the friendly assistance of their fellow-creatures."*

And as it was with our Lord, so is it with the Church which He founded to represent Him when He should be gone. Its whole existence is one living act of Intercession. It stands, like Phinehas, between the living and the dead. Again and again in Church history the Christian bishop or monk actively intercedes for some city which the passionate wrath of an emperor has condemned to destruction. The city of Antioch, which had in some tumult thrown down the image of the Emperor, is saved by the hermit who meets the imperial commissioners and sends them back to remind the Emperor that men are made in the image of God, and are not to be destroyed for the sake of mere sculptured images. Telemachus throws himself between the combatants in the gladiatorial games, and though he perishes himself, yet the games are stopped for the future. More widely still—the inroad of the Northern barbarians

* "Analogy" II. cap. 5.

threatens to overwhelm all that was civilised in Europe, and the Church comes in between: it holds up the standard of a noble worship, of a saintly life, of an absolute truth, and awes and tames the barbarians till they too develop a richer civilisation under its guidance. It is the channel through which God's spiritual means of grace pass to humanity: it is the instrument by which the sorrowing heart and the overburdened is saved from despair: it is the living champion for the truth which shields it against the foes of prejudice, of hatred, of forgetfulness which would destroy it. Many a religious man has felt the truth of the Psalmist's words: "Yea, and I had almost said even as they; but lo, then I should have condemned the generation of Thy children." The witness of the lives of the saints has come in between him and unbelief, and saved him. Always and everywhere the Church is an Intercessor; it is the expression of the mind of the Paraclete, standing by its very existence between God and the world; standing between the world and the forces of evil which threaten it. Intercessory prayer is but the expression of its intercessory life. Through the power of the Holy Spirit that interdependence of man on man which is seen in the actions of daily life finds a new sphere of operations in our prayers. Not merely the actions, not merely the character and influence, but also the praying of a righteous man becomes a great force.

1. It is a great force, first, because it forces us to keep up a true ideal of what those for whom we may pray may be. It makes us, in G. Macdonald's striking phrase, "think of them and God together." If I pray for any one, that implies that I have faith in him, that I believe he may be better than he is. If I pray thoughtfully for any particular blessings for him, then I have considered what are the right blessings to ask for him: I must know what God means him to be; my imagination must picture to itself what his true self is, what it can develop into. Which of us does not know what a power for good this is? To know that some one does believe in us; that some one, knowing all our weakness, yet does believe that we can conquer our temptations; to be with some one who expects us to be better; who has so high an ideal for us that he will not humour us, will not indulge our passing fancies, will not if we lower ourselves by our action, either forsake us or pretend that we have not lowered ourselves; this—even if it come from those who have never knelt in prayer for us—this is effectual intercession. "*Fidelem is putaveris, facies*" is the wise utterance of the Stoic moralist. This, too, is the secret of the power of our Lord Himself; He not only prayed to the Father, but He treated each person as the Father's child.

Further, we know assuredly how important it is to have our conceptions of what the ideal of others should be constantly raised. There is always a tendency to drag it down; every society has its own standard, and judges simply by that; in one society it is money that supplies the test; in another clever intellectual sharpness and brilliant power of epigram; in another birth. Each of these may be good in itself, but each is confessedly partial and inadequate; not the standard of our Lord. And again, our own sins and weaknesses tend to make us expect less from others, to regard them as equally sinful if only we knew it. "Is not this the carpenter's son?" was one judgment upon our Lord, which at least needed supplementing: "We know that this man is a sinner," was another judgment passed upon Him, and that was absolutely false.

That is the first necessary part of intercession; it forces us to keep up the true ideal of life: and this is true not only of prayer for individuals, but of those for bodies of people. We pray for our College, our University, our Church; at once we are forced to have an ideal for each: our imagination is stirred; we picture a more glorious future; a more worthy history for each.

Only here we need one caution: such intercession, if it is to be effective, must be rooted in reality, in actual facts; otherwise it may be as foolish as the intercession of Zebedee's mother for her children.

If we want to pray effectually for our College or our University, we must know their history, we must know for what purposes they were founded, we must know the dangers which have thwarted these purposes, the means by which they have been promoted; we must know how they stand at present in these respects; we must know at what point a forward movement may be made. So it is with individuals; we need to know their virtues and their failings, if prayer is to grow in effectiveness.

But will this not only tend to make us more critical of our neighbours? Yes, it will do so, unless there go with it that which must always be the accompaniment of prayer, nay, which ought always to precede it—thanksgiving. Gratitude has been called the salt of life; it is no less the salt of prayer. Prayer for self, without gratitude for God's mercies, may make us selfish; prayer for others, without gratitude for God's mercies to us in them, may make us critical. There must not be patronising in prayer any more than in deeds of charity. It is not that we are better than they for whom we pray; for else how could we pray for those for whom we care most? It is that we are grateful to God for the good in them—yes, grateful for the capacity for good even in the most degraded, even if we have to decipher the handwriting of God's fingers in the blurred palimpsest of a drunkard's face; it is that we are grateful to God that such as we are allowed in any way whatever to help them forward. In each for whom we pray we have to remember that great saying which Tertullian attributes to our Lord—*Vidisti fratrem*

vidisti dominum tuum ("Thou hast seen thy brother, thou hast seen thy Lord"), and we may not patronise Him. Starting, then, with a heart-felt utterance of thankfulness to God for the mercies given us through him for whom we pray, our first task will be to picture the ideal which he may reach, and the steps by which he may pass from his present actual state to that ideal.

2. Intercession is again a great force, because it pledges us to do the best we can for those for whom we pray. We cannot, for very shame, ask God to help those whom we are refusing to help ourselves when that help lies within our power; the very fact of intercession reminds us of the truth of the dependence of man upon man; we ask God to bless those for whom we care, and again and again He reminds us that His blessings are given through men, and the answer to our prayer is that we are sent on an errand of mercy. Even more than this, the prayer returns into our own bosom; we cannot pray for any one or for any body for which we care without being driven back to look at our own lives. Do we pray for our parents? at once we feel that one of the greatest blessings which can happen to them is that we should be true sons to them. "A wise son maketh a glad father, but a foolish son is the heaviness of his mother." "The father of the righteous shall greatly rejoice, and he that begetteth a wise son shall have joy of him." Do we pray for our College? at once we feel that the College will be helped onward by the example of our own lives, by the courage with which we are able to make a protest against any evil which may show its heads there, or take a vigorous lead in that which is for good. Do we pray for our pupils? at once we feel that one of the greatest blessings for them would be to have over them those who are real students and real Christians themselves, who could lift them into an enthusiasm for learning, a passion for holiness. Do you pray for your tutors? you will soon feel what a strength and stimulus and blessing to them is your own eagerness for knowledge, your own loyalty to be a true and noble conception of University life.

This, then, is the second part of a true intercession: we stop to ask ourselves, Have I done all I can to make that prayer a reality? This is the second reason why true intercession is such a great force in the world. It lifts human nature to the highest level of unselfish action and keeps it there. The type of genuine intercession is Jeanie Deans toiling from Edinburgh to London to win her sister's pardon; it is Esther ready to perish for her father's house and her whole nation, and then robing herself in her royal apparel that she may find favour with the king. These are the types, and the reality is seen on the Cross.

These two factors in intercession are in truth only natural; we have not yet reached the level of the supernatural. These parts at least are free from all questions about prayer and the reign of law; they are open to any one who has a thoughtful and unselfish heart. When we come to our third point it is different.

(3) Intercession is also such a great force, because it brings into action the power of God; just as the tribune's veto would have had no force, if it were only spoken by him on his own responsibility. It was strong because armed with the strength of law; it was strong not with the strength of even a Tiberius Gracchus, but with the power of a sacrosanct authority: so our prayers are strong because they have the promise and the power of Christ behind them. Intercession makes God, God's purposes, God's plans, the centre of our thought. This is of the very essence of all prayer; this it is which lifts it above a mere calculated selfishness into an act of faith. "The central thought and interest of the praying soul is no longer to be self, but God." "I shall strive to win for myself" (these are the words of one who has spoken nobly of prayer)—"I shall strive to win for myself a centre other than myself. It will not satisfy me that my range of topics is sometimes wide and bold, so long as this merely increases, as it were, the size of my circle and leaves the centre unchanged. . . . . To pray aright after God's will I must try to take my right place in the universe of God's Truth. The Presence of God is the Presence of all Truth; and prayer is a rehearsing of life in the Presence of God. In my prayer, then, I enter into relation with all truth. . . . . When I speak with a man, it is mind that touches mind; when I pray to God, my prayer is my approach to the mind of God. That I should enter into the mind of God completely would be the perfectness of prayer. That I should try to enter into it is necessary with a view to success in prayer."* These words were spoken about prayer for self. They are no less true of prayer for others. Even there, those we love are not to be the exact centre of our thoughts: our ultimate object is not to help them. It is rather to help forward God's purposes for them: to view them in the light of His love, to draw out the resources of that love upon them.

This fact at once guides the choice of our prayers for them: health, earthly blessing, prosperity, these we shall ask for them, but they will not be our first petitions. These must be for spiritual blessings; for the power to use aright health, prosperity, earthly blessings; for the power to use aright adversity and want of success; for the great cardinal virtues, for the fruit of the Spirit, for the virtues which won the blessings of the Sermon on the Mount: in a word, for willingness on their part to let God's purposes be done through them. In the light of this we shall recognise that there are

* R. C. Moberley, "On the Enrichment of Prayer," Derby Church Congress Report, p. 520.

limitations to our prayers. Even Abraham with his earnest pleading for Sodom felt that he might not go beyond the plea—"Peradventure there shall be ten found there." Even the Apostle of Love recognises that there is a sin unto death and cannot bid us make request for that. So we would not ask for anything that goes beyond the fixed laws of God's justice or order. It is not that we think of God as unable to change even these laws; it is rather that we know that all His laws are the free expression of His love for man; where knowledge seems to show that they are fixed, we acquiesce and praise Him: where they still lie beyond our knowledge, we pray that they may be moulded to the highest result.

All the stirrings of the human will, all the aspirations for higher things, all of those strange indefinable ways in which our spirit is moved by the influences around us,—on these prayer can play; along these lines it can draw forth blessings from God. And it is this thought which gives us trust and perseverance in prayer. It was this faith that God was there which made Elijah go on praying, though his servant again and again brought back the answer: "There is nothing." It is this which supplements what is lacking in the other two parts of intercession. With all our attempts for others, all our thoughtfulness for them, we may yet be blind to their real interests, we may utterly fail to carry out that on which our hearts are set. Then it is our comfort to feel that intercession is a placing of them in wiser hands than our own; that He to whom we entrust them has the forces of ages in which to work out His purposes, and it becomes possible for us to lay aside our anxieties, to be anxious in nothing, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving to let our requests be made known unto God.

Such are some of the ways in which intercession becomes a force in the world; preserving a true ideal of human nature, raising it to the highest level of unselfish action, bringing into action the working of God Himself. I am inclined to suggest that it would be a help in the method of our intercession to begin at any rate sometimes with the wider circles and gradually to narrow down to our own immediate circle. "I exhort therefore, first of all," says St. Paul, "that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for all men" (1 Tim. ii. 1). We shall be more forced to dwell on the purposes of God if we pray first for all mankind, and then work down through the Church, to our country, our university, our college, our home. The prayer will grow thus in fulness and intensity as we approach the sacred circle, which is the special sphere of our own responsibility, where we start with deeper gratitude, with the keener insight of love for the perfection of those for whom we pray; "when our intercession is made an exercise of love and care for those amongst whom our lot is fallen, or who belong to us in a nearer relation, it then becomes the greatest benefit to ourselves and produces its best effects upon our own hearts."

These are the words of William Law in the chapter on Intercession in his "Serious Call." There are few statements about intercession more beautiful, more stimulating than that. Hear a few more words of his, and I have done.

"There is nothing that makes us love a man so much as praying for him; and when you can do this sincerely for any man, you have fitted your soul for the performance of everything that is kind and civil towards him. This will fill your heart with a generosity and tenderness that will give you a better and sweeter behaviour than anything that is called fine breeding and good manners. Be daily on your knees in a solemn deliberate performance of this devotion, praying for others in such form, with such length, importunity and earnestness as you use for yourself; and you will find all little, ill-natured passions die away, your heart grow great and generous, delighting in the common happiness of others as you used only to delight in your own."

THE CHILDHOOD OF OUR PRESENT LIFE.

SERMON BY THE REV. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A., CURATE-IN-CHARGE OF CHRIST CHURCH, ROTHERHITHE.

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things."—1 COR. xiii. 11 (Epistle for Quinquagesima Sunday).

WE know but little of the childhood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and less of the childhood of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. We know, however, that he was brought up at Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel and trained in the strictest Pharisaism from his earliest days, taught according to the law of the fathers, as he himself says (Acts xxii. 3). And our text tells us that he was very much like other children in his manner of receiving and understanding instruction. Childhood with him as with others, by its babbling words, its impulsive feelings, its crude thoughts indicated a state of ignorance which was, however, in due time to pass away.

Before considering the Apostle's words as a picture of the present in contrast with the future state of things in the unveiled presence of God, let us notice some other uses made of childhood in Holy Scripture which set it before us in different aspects from that of our text.

First, there is a childhood which is necessarily perpetual—that of humility. When the disciples came to our Lord to know who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven He set a child before them, and by this living parable declared to them the crowning grace of the Christian character. "For whosoever," says the Lord, "shall humble himself

as a little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii. 1–4). The kingdom of heaven is made up of such He declared on another occasion (Luke xviii. 16), for all members of that kingdom partake more or less of the childlike character of humility. Indeed, to be humble and teachable is necessary to our acceptance with God. "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii. 4). The humility of a child is no affectation; it is not the pride that apes humility, but it is the outcome of necessity, and a disposition thoroughly natural. The child is humble because he cannot help being humble, for it is in the sense of feebleness and helplessness that his humility lies. And the poverty of spirit of which the Saviour speaks in his Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 3) is but an aspect of humility, wherein, feeling our own need and nothingness, we learn to distrust our own confidences, and so find our strength and sufficiency in God. And this is true, both with regard to the wonders of Divine revelation and the mysteries of Divine Providence. Well says the poet:—

"One part, one little part we dimly scan,
Through the dark medium of life's feverish dream;
Yet dare arraign the whole stupendous plan,
If but that little part incongruous seem.
Nor is that part perhaps what mortals deem:
Oft from apparent ill our blessings rise,
O then renounce the impious self-esteem
That aims to trace the secrets of the skies,
For thou art but of dust: be humble and be wise."*

Learn, therefore, this as the first lesson of childhood, to walk humbly with God and with man. Let humility begin in the heart's grateful submission to God in the Gospel of His grace, and extend to your brethren in the patient services of that love which, as our Apostle tells us in the verses preceding the text, "suffereth long and is kind, which envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, imputeth not evil, rejoiceth not in unrighteousness, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

But there is a childhood which with real Christians ought to be past—the childhood of instability. When our Lord ascended on high, and gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, he gave them, St. Paul tells us, "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering unto the building up of the body of Christ, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," that, as a consequence, "we may be no more children, tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error" (Eph. iv. 11-14). A child, if left to himself, is liable, as the result of his ignorance and immaturity, to become the prey of false teachers and evil-disposed people, who may practise on his weakness and do him injury, both in body and soul. And how many in these last days are thus the sport and prey of the propagators of error, evermore tossed too and fro like the waves of the sea by the shifting winds of men's opinions. The sentiments of such change like the seasons, and the emblem of their religion is the chameleon, of ever-varying hue. They have no settledness of mind, because their hearts are not established by grace. Unstable as water, they can never excel. The Word of God corrects this state of mind and inculcates a fixed faith, points us to a resting-place in Christ, and says, "This is the Son: hear ye Him."

Learn again, then, to put away the childhood of instability in the faith by a personal union with Christ, the living Head of His Body, the Church. Amid all the fluctuations of human teaching, and the varieties of doctrine propounded for your acceptance, lay firm hold of Him who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—the all-atoning Saviour, the ever-living High Priest, the never-failing Friend. And thus, being joined to the Christ of God, you will have a share of His Spirit, for he that saith, "Abide in Him," saith also, in the same place, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things" (1 John ii. 20, 28). So, when shallow professors and half-hearted disciples are forsaking the fellowship of the great Master, you will turn to Him with the clinging confidence of Peter, when tempted in like manner: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John vi. 68).

Our text tells us of another childhood—that of ignorance which, though it lasts through this life, is to be done away in the life to come. Our present knowledge is such that, in the clearer light of the future life, it will vanish away as the stars of heaven before the rising sun.

In considering the childhood of our present life, let us notice (1) how small, comparatively, is the extent of our knowledge. "We know in part," says the Apostle (1 Cor. xiii. 9). The fact of sin we know, the mystery of it is unravelled. Though we know so much of our bodily organism, how little we know of its relation to the soul and spirit. And when we rise to beings higher in the spiritual scale than ourselves, how our ignorance betrays itself, till when we think of the nature of God Himself we are utterly lost, and have reason to exclaim with the Psalmist, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it" (Ps. cxxxix. 6).

It is, we see, in facts and phenomena that our knowledge lies, and in the causes and connections of things that we find our ignorance. And thus we prove ourselves children. The child soon learns the facts of his existence and of the little world

* Beattie's "Minstrel."

around him. He learns what hunger is, and what is the satisfaction of food; he enjoys the warmth of the sun, but he learns to fear the fire. He loves the light, and makes early acquaintance with the flowers that strew his path in all their beauty and fragrance. But the hidden causes and connections of the things he knows and loves or dislikes are far beyond his ken, nor are they necessary to his admiration of the world and his enjoyment of life. And thus it is with us "children of a larger growth": "We know in part." "We know," and therein lies our happiness and joy. But "we know in part," and therein lies cause for humility and faith and hope. "We know," but not completely, not as we are known.

And here, in passing, may I not sound a warning note to those who know so much that they cannot know any more. They have a smattering of theology, and they know a number of texts and passages of Scripture, and armed in this paltry panoply they are proof against the teaching of sermons and of books. And in them is fulfilled the saying of St. Paul, "If any thinketh that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know" (1 Cor. viii. 2). These religious wiseacres seem to have nothing to learn, either in this world or in the world to come. They learnt everything about Christianity years and years ago, whereas our Apostle confesses that we have only the first-fruits and earnest of knowledge in this life, and though it is enough, it is not too much to crave for more.

But, again, "we prophesy in part" (1 Cor. xiii. 9). We can only "speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen," and our testimony will exactly correspond in value to our experience. Our experience is an experience of facts—facts of the material world, as the resurrection of Christ declared through the Christian ages on the indubitable evidence of eye-witnesses; facts of the world of providence in the fulfilment of events foretold in Scripture, in the divine guidance of our own lives, and the divine government of the nations; and facts of the spiritual world in our own change of heart, conversion to God, and growth in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But we do not profess to explain the causes and connections of all such things. A child may bear witness of a fact which he cannot explain. We cannot explain the origin of evil, but we bear witness to its power, and also to the divine remedy provided for it. We cannot trace the workings of providence, but we know that all things work together for good to all that love God. We know not the way of the Spirit, but we believe in His presence and effectual grace. And here we find an answer to scoffers, and cavillers, and sceptics, who will have everything made plain to them by a mathematical demonstration. Books of Christian evidences are most valuable, but they can never make things of faith objects of sight, and they must always leave many subjects unexplained. It was something of this sort that Job wanted, but God satisfied him without it in the end. And we cannot pretend to go beyond God in the matter. "We prophesy," and in that prophesying, or showing forth of truth and grace and love in the Lord Jesus Christ you have abundant source of consolation. But "we prophesy in part," and in that necessary part-prophesying lies an appeal to your faith and hope, to wait for the revelation of Christ from heaven, and "for the grace that is to be brought unto you" at His coming, when you shall know Him as you are known by Him. For—

> The morning shall awaken, the shadows shall decay,
> And each true-hearted servant shall shine as doth the day.

(2.) But not only is the extent of our knowledge small and childlike. but the manner of it is mediatory and childlike also. "When I was a child I spake as a child"—this has been understood as a reference to the gift of tongues; "I thought" (felt or perceived) "as a child, I understood" (reasoned or judged) "as a child." These descriptions have been referred to knowledge and prophecy. The child's perceptions are vague, his feelings are too much under the influence of the senses, his thoughts and reasonings are weak and superficial, and his words, as he speaks with stammering lips and lisping tongue, are but the transcript of his thoughts within. And such says the Apostle Paul is our present state. Language and prophecy are but imperfect instruments, and the knowledge associated with them and arising from them, must be imperfect likewise. A further illustration is used by the Apostle to set forth the imperfectness of the present state of knowledge. "For now," he writes, "we see through a glass," in a mirror, the dull metallic mirror of ancient days; "now we see . . . darkly" (*ἐν αἰνίγματι*) obscurely, as in a riddle or an enigma. Both the means and the manner of our knowledge are imperfect. St. Paul may have had in mind Num. xii. 6, 8, where the Lord contrasting the visions and dreams vouchsafed to prophets, with his open communications to Moses, says, "With him will I speak, mouth to mouth, even apparently and not in dark speeches (*δι' αἰνιγμάτων*, LXX), and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold." God's Word is the mirror in which we see ourselves (James i. 23-25) and see the glory of the Lord (2 Cor. iii. 18), but if language as we know it in our present state is an imperfect medium of human thought, it must be a much more imperfect medium of the divine. And though there is great plainness of speech used in the New Testament, its language concerning such subjects as the being of God and all the depths and heights of spiritual truth must of necessity be far outmeasured by the great realities which it describes. Yet God speaks to us His truth as we can bear it, and doubtless, therefore, revelation is fitted to our present state, although—for "the eye

of faith is dim"—we only see darkly and imperfectly, wondering oft at the things we cannot understand, perplexed at the things we cannot explain.

But the day is coming when, having attained to heavenly maturity, we shall have put away the childish things of this present state of the imperfect knowledge associated with the written Word, the offices of worship and the exercise of faith. "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face." Like the Israelites at the foot of Sinai when Moses went up into the Mount and communed with God, as a friend with his friend, and beheld the glory of God, we for the present see the heavenly realities by the precious but imperfect media of ordinance and prophecy and human language, and know our Lord but by faith. But soon after a season of waiting shall we be called up into His presence to behold Him face to face, to hear His welcome voice, and free from sin His glory evermore to share. And in view of such a blessed consummation, let us rejoice and be exceeding glad.

Father of Jesus, love's reward,
What rapture will it be,
Prostrate before Thy throne to lie,
And gaze and gaze on Thee!

THE Bishop of Coventry, on visiting Coventry on the 17th inst. to preside at a public meeting, was presented with an Episcopal ring by the local clergy and laity.

THE Bishop of Mashonaland, who has sufficiently recovered from his severe attack of influenza to be able to go to Bournemouth, has been ordered entire rest for several weeks.

THE Bishop of Winchester has taken up his residence at the Deanery until the first week in April, when he hopes to take possession of Farnham Castle. He returned thanks in the cathedral on Sunday for his recovery and preached.

ON the afternoon of the 12th inst. the Rev. E. J. Houghton, Vicar of Blockley, who has been appointed an Honorary Canon, was duly instituted in the Chapter-house at Worcester. During the ordinary service in the cathedral he was installed by the Dean in the usual manner.

IT IS stated that the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol is about to appoint an assistant Rural Dean to assist Canon Mather in his work in the Bristol deanery. This step is rendered necessary by the increase in population and in Church organisations in the Bristol deanery.

THE Bishop of Worcester offered Canon the Hon. Henry Douglas, Vicar of St. Paul's, Worcester, the valuable rectory of Richard's Castle, near Ludlow. Mr. Douglas has held important positions in the Scotch Episcopal Church, and worked for seven years under Bishop Gray, whose chaplain he was at Capetown. From 1885 to 1877 he was rector of Hanbury, Worcestershire, a living of nearly a thousand a year, which he resigned, in order to work in one of the poorest parishes in Worcester, which he refuses now to leave, and he has therefore declined the Bishop's offer.—*Church Review.*

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1892.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

A GOOD deal of attention is now being given to the subject of provision of old age; with surprising unanimity men of all political parties have taken the matter up, and schemes which two years ago were confined to a few philanthropists and social reformers are now being discussed as affairs of national polity. In fact old age provision is the pressing need of our era—in all departments of life people are worn out quicker than they used to be, retirement from work as old age comes on is made necessary from the actual want of rest, and compulsory by the failing powers, which are no longer equal to the struggle of competition, whether he will or no, the old man must be pushed aside by younger and stronger folk.

The details of any scheme of national insurance cannot be elaborated hastily, and we are still a great way from a system whereby every English man or woman who is ready to work, and inclined to save, may find a means of storing up, without undue self-denial, an adequate provision for the evening of life. The spirit of the time, however, is at work, and friendly societies, insurance offices, and even the Post Office, are casting about to see what methods they can devise to promote this new form of thrift. Here are the main points:—

I. The provision must be of the pension kind—an annual income, certain so long as the life of the pensioner lasts.

II. It must be secured by annual or other regular instalments, beginning early, and, if possible, diminishing as the wage earning power diminishes.

III. There must be no confiscation about it, *i.e.*, Should the insurer be unable or disinclined to continue his payments, he ought to have his money back, with fair interest.

IV. There must be no complications about the bargain—it should be absolutely inviolable.

There are at present very few institutions which fulfil all these requirements, and yet they are the *minimum* of a successful scheme. The worst failure is the Post Office, which is dear and bad and involves a needless amount of publicity and circumlocution—friendly societies are very expensive and we are not aware that any one of them, except the Odd Fellows, have devised any scheme for old age provision. Most insurance companies are in the same condition, and insurance companies generally are out of the range of those who need them most, except certain of them which have vast armies of canvassers and collectors, and whose working expenses, therefore, are so vast that they cannot be profitable institutions to insurers.

One insurance office, however, has stepped into the field with by far the best system yet invented, and one which seems very nearly perfect. The Church of England Life Assurance Company, secretary, H. M. Baker, Esq., 9 and 10, King Street, Cheapside, E.C.., has issued in a pamphlet entitled, "Perfected Pensions," an exposition of its own method of this new form of endowment assurance. A few illustrations will best explain it. Our first condition is met—an annual income is assured beginning at any age, from 50 to 65. It is usual at present to consider the date of senescence to be the age of 65, and it may be as well to note that at 65 the average expectancy of life is, roughly speaking, eleven years. A man of 30 then, the age at which a sensible appreciation of the needs of the future begins, desires to secure a pension at the age of 65. The Church of England Assurance Office will secure him a pension of £100 a year for an annual premium of £15, or taking £10 as the pension unit, each £10 of pension will cost £1 10s. per annum until the pension age is reached. At the age of 25 each £10 of pension will cost £1 4s. per annum only, and at the age of 35, £1 18s. 4d.

If the insurer is in a position to secure his pension right off, the Church of England Assurance Office will meet his views, and in that case each £10 of pension will cost at the age of 25 £26 7s. 10d., or at the age of 30 £30 19s. 3d.

The essential conditions we have laid down are fairly met; in case of inability or disinclination to continue premiums, the money paid is returned, with 2½ per cent. interest, and the policies are absolutely inviolable except through positive fraud; there is, however, no scale at present of diminishing payments.

It is needless to elaborate the advantages of this pension scheme, and one class of persons, the clergy, ought especially to be benefited by it. There is no clergyman who at 30 ought not to lay by at least £15 a year, and there are very few who do not greatly need £100 a year at the age of 65. While the present ridiculously inadequate pensions for retired incumbents are all the clergy can hope for, this method of assurance comes as at least a partial solution of the problems of poverty which age and incapacity bring. Under the present rule very few clergy on retiring can expect a pension of as much as £100 per annum, and that is hardly enough to live upon; but if the clergyman is provided with the means of securing an additional £100, it becomes enough—we are spared the painful spectacle of the old man clinging to burdens he can no longer bear for the sake of daily bread, and by judicious retirement the way is cleared for the younger men whose promotion is at present sadly blocked. The scheme was not intended primarily for the clergy, but it is so appropriate that their necessities must clearly have been carefully considered. We commend it to all clergymen, and to all those who are interested in clearing away the many difficulties which at present beset the minister and hamper him in his work, the greatest of which are not so much the needs of the present as the anxieties of the future. One criticism occurs to us. We are not disposed to pick holes in a scheme which is in every way so admirable. The pension is said to begin six months after the pension age is attained. It ought to begin as soon as the age is reached, otherwise it is a pension at the age of 65½. Moreover, there should be an understanding about broken half-years. Suppose the pensioner dies just before, or even three months before another half-year is due, there should be a distinct understanding as to the rights of his representatives?—our own opinion is a *pro rata* allowance should be made.

WILLIAM REEVES, LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

THE "PRAYER BOOK" CHURCHMAN.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, D.D., RECTOR OF WARRENPOINT, AUTHOR OF "THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK," "IRELAND SINCE THE REFORMATION," "IRELAND SINCE THE UNION," ETC.

(*Continued from page* 94.)

IT is vain to talk of a heterogeneous ecclesiastical Council, such as some fancy can be easily and advantageously had while the framework of the old constitutional one remains in desuetude rather than extinction. Further, the Church in Ireland is a part of the same whole as that in England, and though the Irish portion labours under disabilities, it is no reason why it should strike out a new system for its own action, or invent, as it were, a new language for the expression of its wants. It will be time enough when England sets the example for the smaller component to follow it, and not put itself in the condition of a pilot boat to the great ship—unless, indeed, it were judged desirable in this case to carry out the maxim, "experimentum fiat in vili corpore." . . . . "Every one

who is acquainted with the history of Convocation knows what time, what labour, what zeal were wasted in frivolous discussions, and what bad feelings were engendered by party struggles in one house, and its antagonism to the other; how wild precipitancy was charged on one, and timid vacillation on the other, euphemistically expressed by Zeal and Wisdom.

But Convocations, with all their defects, have done a great amount of work, and have done it well. In Ireland the Convocation provided Confessions of Faith, compiled ecclesiastical codes, and stamped with ecclesiastical authority the formularies of the Church. It brought together in co-operation the various orders of the Church, and gave opportunity to men from the remotest ends of the country to meet and practically learn that they were embarked in a common cause."

It was in connection with this paper that William Connor Magee made one of his characteristic speeches containing two facts—an illustration and the short prayer that the Church of Ireland might not die "that most ignominious and agonising of all deaths, 'Asphyxiation by lawyers.'" Many strange events have happened since 1868, yet surely one cannot imagine a more unlooked for destiny than that of the quiet, retiring scholar who cast a wistful gaze back on Convocation as a possible solution of the vexed question of lay agency being called on to preside eighteen years later over the diocese of Down, Connor and Dromore, with its system of Diocesan Synod and Council; its vestries and boards of patronage; its strong Protestant tendencies; its 200,000 Church people and 230 clergy; its hard common sense and fierce Puritan zeal; its Presbyterian background; its teeming population of artisans and mill-workers; its great hives of human industry clustered round Belfast, and Belfast itself with its insufficient church accommodation and overburdened clergy and its thousand and one problems of Church life awaiting solution. Such matters, we believe, are divinely ordered, and of this at least we are certain that this destiny found out this man, and sought him and laid hold of him without any volition of his own—nay, so sorely against his will that nothing could have moved him to accept the trust, but that feeling of duty which was at all times the ruling principle of his life.

III.

On the 2nd of April, 1870, the General Convention of the Church of Ireland appointed a committee consisting of the Archbishops, Bishops, and others to revise the Canons of 1634, and to report to the first General Synod that should meet after the 1st day of January, 1871, what modifications they considered necessary in view of the altered circumstances of the Church.

Dr. Reeves was one of the members of this committee, and henceforth we find him both in the General Synod as a member, and acting on its committees through all the trying scenes that followed Disestablishment. It is easy for those who knew Dr. Reeves to imagine what pain the attendance during the debates upon revision must have caused him. His own views were too deeply grounded upon Church principles, and his acceptance of the doctrines of the Church was too complete and unquestioning to make him tolerant of those professing to dislike and even to disbelieve certain parts of the Prayer Book, he never believed in compromise where principle was at stake. I am not sure that at that time he was hopeful as to the future of the Church, and I do know that the late Primate, his most intimate friend, took a despondent view of it. Dr. Reeves was averse to all change. With his intense reverence for the Liturgy, his dislike of innovation, his deeply rooted prejudices in favour of ancient customs and time-honoured traditions to say nothing of his full acceptance of the doctrines in dispute as they were formulated in the Book of Common Prayer, he must have been shocked beyond measure by much that was said during those debates. Like the Primate, he was quite satisfied with the Prayer Book as it was, and like him he believed that any change made in it was for the worse and not for the better, and his opinions on this subject never underwent any change or modification down to the last year of his life. So strongly did he resent alterations in the established order of divine service that the custom which prevails in some churches of repeating the general thanksgiving after the clergyman caused him acute pain. He was not an advocate for musical services, his taste being, in this as in other respects, simple even to severity, so that while he was a Churchman after the Prayer Book model he was anything but a Ritualist. In the General Synod he did not come to the front as a debater. He rarely if ever took part in a debate, but his vote could always be reckoned on, and his influence was invariably exercised in behalf of that moderate party whose tact and moderation contributed so much to the ultimate and peaceable settlement of the question of Revision. We hardly realise how much we owe to that body of loyal churchmen with whom Dr. Reeves acted. We are apt to forget that many of them must have been painfully conscious that in pursuing the course they did, they were rendering their chance of future recognition in a voluntary Church doubtful in the extreme. The temptation to temporise must have been at times well-nigh overmastering; the temptation to give up the struggle and yield to clamour and prejudice and factious intolerance must have been at times strongly present. But it needed a stern sense of duty to induce a man whose whole soul was in his books to forego his studies and sacrifice his leisure, receiving in exchange, declamation which, though sometimes brilliant, was often vapid, theology, which was rarely sound, and recrimination, which was too frequently directed against his friends, or his opinions, and which seldom erred on the side of charity. But as Dr. Jellett pointed out in his admirable address already quoted, though much in the debates of the early meetings of the Synod must have pained Dr. Reeves, he continued to act not only as a member, but even recorded the proceedings of committees as honorary secretary, because he felt that it was a duty he owed to the Church to do so. But there is another side to this question and it is right to emphasise it, and to give credit where credit is due. It is comparatively easy to find out defects in our present Church system, and to paint them blacker than they are. Take, for instance, this very danger which was present to the minds of men like Primate Beresford and Dr. Reeves—the dominant control exercised by the laity. What however is the fact? Some of those very men who braved popular opinion are now more truly respected by the laity than those who yielded to the current and went with it, and in proof of this I venture to invite attention to the case before us—that of one whose motto was throughout life: "Compromises are bad things; they never please anybody, and end in

making fresh trouble. Keep to the straight line and all must come straight in the end."

Yet he who never courted popular applause, nor shrank from popular clamour, was elected Bishop by popular consent, and was respected by the laity for his firmness, and honoured for his consistency, though all men knew that his "Yea," was "Yea," and his "Nay," "Nay."

In 1875 he was appointed Dean of Armagh, but he still held the parish of Tynan and the post of Librarian of Armagh.

What the people of Tynan thought of him may be gathered from the following resolution passed by the Select Vestry early in the present year, when news of his death reached the parish. "At a meeting of the Select Vestry of Tynan parish, Co. Armagh, the Rector, Rev. R. J Shaw-Hamilton, D.D., in the chair, after a resolution placing on record their sorrow at the death of his Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, and their sympathy with her Majesty the Queen, the Prince and Princess of Wales, and all the members of the royal family, the following resolution also was passed unanimously :—'The Select Vestry of the Parish of Tynan desire to express their sorrow at the death of the Right Rev. William Reeves, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore, who had been rector of Tynan Parish for twenty-one years before his consecration to the episcopate, their affectionate remembrance of his ministry amonst them, and their sense of the loss which the Church has sustained. And they desire to convey to his family the expression of their sympathy, while they pray that God will comfort and bless them in their sorrow.'"

What cause the good people of Tynan had for their sorrow may be told by one qualified to speak on the subject.

IV.

The Faithful Rector.

The following testimony comes from a dignitary of the diocese of Armagh, whose modesty leads to the request that it shall appear from a "nameless neighbour":—"The twenty-one years' ministry of our loved and valued Dean at Tynan was in keeping with the rest of his calm, systematic, studious, yet cheerful life —marked by the most singular conscientiousness and minute accuracy of work, but with little of that excitement which attracts public attention. Simple and unaffected in demeanour, any approach to ostentation was abhorrent to his nature, and he preferred to make his parish rounds on foot, and generally walked to and from the railway station and the rectory with his bag in his hand, well pleased while so engaged to have a little pleasant conversation with parishioner or friend. It was his habit to rise early, kindle his own fire, and devote his morning hours to varied studies.

Librarian at Armagh when appointed to the rectory of Tynan, he continued and completed his amazingly minute and full catalogue of the books in the library, and of their important contents; but while so engaged, and preparing works which have given him an European fame, he also found time to master the history, both ecclesiastical and civil, of his own parish, and committed this to paper in his own exquisite handwriting. With a mind thus stored with local information, and full of interest in all that concerned his charge—the ancient tenures of the parish, the signification of the townland names, the history of its antiquarian remains, the records of its former owners, the circumstances of its settlement in later times, and the manner in which the property and farms came into the possession of their present occupants and owners—he was enabled to approach his parishioners more in the guise of an old familiar friend than that of a stranger, and he soon obtained a firm hold on their affections, learned to call old and young by their Christian names, entered with interest into all their concerns, and did not cease to follow their careers even when they migrated to neighbouring parishes or distant lands. Most regular and attentive in the visitation of the sick, he made it also his practice to visit every household before the festivals of Easter and Christmas, at other times it gave him pleasure to make his visit coincide (as his tenacious memory and accuracy of record enabled him to do) with the anniversary of some interesting family occurrence—a wedding, birth, or funeral—and so he was enabled to express his sympathy with the family joys and sorrows. Father as well as pastor of his flock, he became at length so deeply attached to them, that it was with difficulty he could be persuaded to leave them when the *unanimous* voice of the diocese called him to the episcopacy. He felt the parting so keenly that for a considerable time he could not trust himself to return, and when at length he ventured to spend a few days in the parish, not very long before he was called to his reward, he visited every family, and leaving his hospitable quarters early one morning walked to a neighbouring parsonage for breakfast, and then called on such of his former parishioners as had made their homes in that neighbourhood. One of these relates how he entered her home, and the joyful greeting over, drew from his pocket his snuff-box and offered a pinch of snuff. When she laughingly said, "I don't take snuff," he smiled, and said, "I offered it because, on the very first visit I paid your worthy mother, she offered me a pinch from her box, and by the same token she was seated in that very chair you now occupy." Many stories of such pleasantries and reminiscences abound in the parish. He was ever most punctual in attendance at the choir practices, coming often from Armagh for that purpose. "The parish schools were repeatedly and statedly visited, and he took special care that every child should be well instructed in the Church Catechism : A true and sincere Churchman of the older type, he loved her Formularies, and held the Book of Common Prayer in the highest reverence, was a great authority on its history, and opposed every attempt to alter it. But, while most earnest in his devotion to the Church, he was far too large-hearted, and of too genial a nature to allow his strong convictions to narrow his sympathies or restrain his friendly intercourse with others, and he had many sincere admirers and friends amongst those who differed widely from him in such matters.

"Open, frank, generous, witty, sometimes such friendly opponents were tempted to take advantage of his playfulness to strike at his pronounced churchmanship; but it was rarely possible to get the advantage of him even in jest, as the following anecdote illustrates : —'A Presbyterian, strolling with him through a garden infested with a weed popularly called Bishop's weed, turned to him and asked, "Mr. Dean, what is the most difficult *weed* to eradicate from a garden?" touching the plant at the same moment with his stick. But he did not gain much by the pleasantry, for the Dean promptly replied, "If you mean that 'garden ash' you are entirely mistaken, it is very far from being as pestilent as the *Dwarf Elder*." His religious emotions, sincere and calm in their even flow, wer

clear as the waters of the deep sea, and he could hardly understand, and had little sympathy with that gushing, emotional, religious excitement which, like the surf broken on the beach, is discoloured by so much mingled earth. He seemed to think false religious excitement more hurtful to the growth of sincere piety than the indulgence in innocent pleasures which ran no risk of being mistaken for religious exercises.

"By nature full of the milk of human kindness, it was pleasant to observe how the learned and somewhat stately dignitary unbent in the family and amongst his friends, but above all to his beloved orphaned grandchildren. It seemed to give him genuine pleasure when he had it in his power to help a neighbouring clergyman in time of need, and that they might have less scruple in asking for the assistance of his curate, he made it his practice when in his own church to take upon himself the entire conduct of the services, and used to say it was only a pleasure to him and no toil. Again, when scruples of modesty made younger neighbours hesitate to ask a dignitary of such standing and age to Sunday School examinations or similar gatherings, he took care to let them understand that when his varied duties left him at liberty, it gave him pleasure to assist. Living by himself, he was most simple in his tastes and easily satisfied; but he was the very soul of hospitality, he loved to have his friends at his table and the unbounded hospitality which at the library he extended to clergy and laity alike, as they came to Armagh for such meetings as synods, councils or other gatherings, caused him to be widely known by the name of 'Gaius, mine host, and of the whole Church.'"

"At his own table, and wherever one met him, the wide range of his reading, his infinite store of personal anecdote, his accurate recollection of past scenes made him a most interesting and charming companion ; and the Dean of St. Patrick's justly noticed a marked feature in his conversation—that in the ceaseless variety of his stories of men and manners he never repeated anything unkind which one could wish unsaid. Such was the man as he presented himself to me. I never expect to meet so true, sincere and considerate a friend. As I have said, his manner of working his parish was so quiet, that even those in the adjoining parishes heard little of his work except incidentally. I cannot, therefore, give you as full an illustration of his life as I could wish."

I venture, however, to think that this is a speaking picture, the picture of a simple life, beautiful in its unstudied natural loveliness.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

THE ANALOGY OF EXISTENCES, AND CHRISTIANITY. By Charles J. Wallace, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6s.

THE subjects treated of in this unpretentious volume are of absorbing interest. "Life"; "Death"; "Fruits," "Law," "Formation," "Transformation," "Paradise," "Godhead," etc., are the titles of some of the chapters. The author tells us that he refers in its pages to no books, but to the books of "Nature" and "Revelation." That the author is a diligent student and keen observer of nature no one, who carefully reads his book, can doubt ; and many of the lessons and illustrations he gives us are very beautiful and suggestive. At page 76, he says : "It is invariably the case with all things in nature that any existence wherein life eventually moves will be as 'dead' first before that time comes when it could be called living. Take the rosebud which you may wish to bud into the briar ; it must become disconnected, it must be 'dead' to its first parent before it lives again upon the briar." Again : "There can be no doubt but that, previous to the present age of life upon this earth, the earth itself existed in a state of 'lifelessness.' We are given clearly to understand this fact also in the Bible account of those earlier ages. The earth was void and formless, dark and hidden and dead." At page 80 we have a beautiful passage descriptive of the moon ; we quote a few lines from it :—

"The sun's life-feeding rays fall upon it as upon this earth, yet there is no life to feed upon the dry skeleton of what was. The objects which those living beams would act upon are different. The one *is* dead, the other *was* dead, and 'liveth.'" But the great charm of the book lies in its simplicity of style, and the modesty with which the author works out his theories. There is an entire absence of that arrogant dogmatism which mars many books of the kind, and the sublime truths of the Christian religion are treated of with the greatest possible reverence. The writer firmly holds to the belief in future blessedness and future retribution, and the last chapter of this most interesting book deals with these fundamental truths and that great "Hereafter," when "old things have for ever passed away," and "the eternal joys of eternal life will alone fully be experienced and realised in endless perfection." (p. 309.) The book is attractively brought out, and printed in good clear type, and the very full "Syllabus" of the subjects dealt with, is exceedingly helpful to the readers. Would that all authors were as accurate and painstaking !

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." February, 1892. Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark.

THE writer of the "Notes" ventures to prophesy that one of the great books of the season will be the translation of Wendt's "Contents of the Teaching of Jesus." Are there not already so many books on that topic ?

A very useful feature of the *Expository Times* is the opportunity given for asking about difficulties of every kind ; and the answers are given by competent men and are signed.

"THE THINKER." February, 1892. London : James Nisbet & Co.

THIS number is a good deal taken up with criticisms of Canon Cheyne's "Bampton Lectures." An age which takes pin-hunting seriously, and thinks wisdom is to be found by counting heads—or rather marks—at a polling-booth, may well believe Canon Cheyne's theory of the date of the Psalter. We don't.

We should say the second number of the *Thinker* is quite equal to its predecessor.

THE Rev. Wilfrid J. Richmond has resigned the benefice of St. Catherine's, Birtles, in the diocese of Chester.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

IS THERE A PURGATORY?

SIR,—I wish to be allowed to thank Dr. Donaldson for his vigorous treatment of this question, and to assure him that I never allude to this subject in the pulpit, and do not wish to preach on any subject on which I am not clear. The subject is also speculative. But I wish to ask one question, and, as far as I am concerned, to write no more on the subject.

I have taught that, at the Day of Judgment, we shall all rise together, and after the judgment the sentence will be passed.

If Dives is in "the Hell" of the devil and his angels, how could he wish to send to his brethren? and, If Abraham's bosom is the Heaven of God, why should he be asleep?

VICAR.

February 19th, 1891.

EDITH C. REYNOLDS, writing to the *Times*, from the Vicarage, East Ham, states that for many years the Church Sunday School had been held in one of the board schools there, and there was no other building in the place which would give the room needed. "Our school is a large one; it has grown from 50 to nearly 600 children. We have now, however, received notice from the board to quit, our main offence being that we teach the Church Catechism, and have refused to give up teaching it. The move against us has been due to an outburst of local Dissenting bigotry. The result must be that at the end of this year there will be some 400 of our children for whom we can find no school place. Our opponents tell us that the Church is a rich body, that the Archbishop of Canterbury has £15,000 a year, and that, therefore, we ought to have no difficulty in raising the £1,000 which we should need to build schools of our own. I only hope it may prove so, for in this very poor parish we can do nothing without outside help."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS

Allen, Rev. G. C., M.A., Assistant-Master of Dulwich College; Head Master of Surrey County School, Cranleigh.
Archer, Rev. George Frederick, M.A.; Vicar of Croxton, Norfolk.
Armfield, Rev. H. T., M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Colne Engaine, Essex; Rural Dean of Halstead.
Bladon, Rev. George, Vicar of St. Luke's, Chadderton, Oldham; Vicar of All Saints', Higher Walton, Preston.
Bradley, Rev. Henry Waldron, M.A.; Vicar of St. Catherine's, Birtles, Crewe.
Browne, Ven. J. F., Archdeacon of Madras; Rector of Flax Bourton, Bristol.
Chope, Rev. Clement Robert, B.A.; Rector of Combe Pyne, Devonshire.
Cooper, Rev. E.; Vicar of Bearley, Warwickshire.
Cruddas, Rev. George, B.A.; Rector of Huntsham, Tiverton.
Dale, Rev. Reginald Francis, M.A.; Rector of Bletchingdon, Oxon; Rector of Hampton Poyle, Oxon, by dispensation.
Dermer, Rev. E. C., B.D., Vicar of SS. Phillip and James, Oxford; Rural Dean of Oxford.
Eden, Rev. F. N., M.A., formerly Vicar of St. James's, West Hartlepool; Vicar of Belvedere, Kent.
Fenwick, Rev. W. A., M.A., Vicar of Bodmin; Chaplain to the Sheriff for Cornwall, Mr. E. Brydges-Williams, of Carnanton.
Fitch, Rev. T. W., M.A., Vicar of Lullington, Sussex; Rector of Littlington (by dispensation).
Fossett, Rev. William Stewart, Curate of Hawkesbury; Vicar of Acton, Turville, Gloucestershire.
Gedge, Rev. W. W., M.A., Rector of Barnby; Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the southern part of the deanery of Lothingland.
Hardern, Rev. T. B., M.A., Chaplain of the Liverpool Workhouse; Acting Chaplain to the 6th Liverpool Volunteers.
Hart, Rev. J. W. T., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, New Swindon; Incumbent of St. Cuthbert's, Hawick.
Hill, Rev. John Seymour Granville, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Newport, Barnstaple.
Hughes, Rev. Canon N. T., M.A., Vicar of St. Edmund's, Northampton; Vicar of Hardingstone, Northants.
Lane, Rev. Henry T., M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans, and Diocesan Examiner of Elementary Schools in religious knowledge; Vicar of Bishop's Stortford.
Lewis, Rev. Arthur, M.A.; Vicar of Axmouth, Devonshire.
Loveband, Rev. Matthew Thomas, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Chittlehamholt, Devonshire.
Milner, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Caundle Stourton; Vicar of Coombe, Bissett and Homington, Salisbury.
Morris, Rev. A.; Vicar of Wythall, Alvechurch.
Nicholson, Rev. Ralph, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Marks' District Church, Rye-hill, Newcastle; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Elswick, Northumberland.
Orde, Rev. R. J. C., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Castleton, Derbyshire.
Peters, Rev. George, Curate-in-Charge of St. George's, Everton; Curate-in-Charge of St. Barnabas's, Liverpool.
Pinder, Rev. North, M.A., Rector of Grays, and Rural Dean of Henley-on-Thames; Honorary Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.
Quirk, Rev. J. F., M.A., Vicar of Grasby, near Caistor; Rector of Great Coates, near Grimsby.
Sherard, Rev. C. William, M.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Smith, Rev. Barnard Gooch, M.A., Rector of Thurlton, Norfolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.
Smith, Rev. W. H., M.A.; Vicar of St. Paul's, Birmingham.
Stitt, Rev. S. S., B.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Sykes, Rev. E. S.; Vicar of Hedworth, Durham.
Templeman, Rev. E. M. W.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Tomlinson, Rev. Routh, M.A., Curate; Rector of Finchampstead, Berks.
Vawdrey, Rev. Llewelyn B., M.A., Vicar of Maer, Staffordshire; Vicar of Tusingham, Cheshire.
Ward, Rev. L. T., Assistant-Curate of St. Matthew's, Exeter; Vicar of Holcombe Rogus, Devonshire.
Ware, Rev. Douglas Povell, M.A., Incumbent of St. Cuthbert's, Hawick; Vicar of St. Paul's, New Swindon.
Weeks, Rev. F. H. B., M.A.; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Jelly-hill.
Williams, Rev. C. L., Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton; Vicar of Christ Church, Ramsgate.
Wood, Rev. William, D.D., Vicar of Cropredy and Rural Dean of Deddington; Honorary Canon of Christ Church, Cathedral, Oxford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bacon, Rev. Thomas, late Rector of Kingsworthy, at Torquay, on the 19th inst., aged 78.
Barney, Rev. John, M.A., Rector since 1861, at the Rectory, Rattlesden, on the 22nd inst., aged 79.
Fitch, Rev. E. H., Vicar of Burgh-by-Sands, Carlisle, on the 18th inst., aged 51 years.
Hyde, Rev. J. T., Rector of Ruan Lanihorne, at Barnstaple, on the 13th inst., aged 66.
Lyus, Rev. Frederick Ormiston, at Tilney, St. Lawrence, Norfolk, on the 15th inst., aged 51.
Oxenden, the Right Reverend Ashton, D.D., formerly Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada, at Biarritz, on the 22nd inst., aged 84.
Paxton, Rev. William Archibald, M.A., for forty-one years Rector of Otterden, at Otterden, Faversham, on the 15th inst., aged 74.

The Church of England Pulpit.

LENT.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester.

"Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile."—Mark vi. 31.

THESE words were spoken by our Saviour to His disciples, upon their return from their missionary journey through Galilee and Judæa. He had sent them out, by two and two together, six parties of them in all, to preach repentance and remission of sins. You can fancy how they must have gone forth, all of them novices, and some of them young men. Imagine it, you who have not yet survived the memory of your own younger days—the new-born sense of our own importance, which accompanies our first attempt at responsible action; the childlike hopefulness, to which no miracle of success seems impossible; all the bright illusions, all the golden dreams of youth—that time of life when every subject possesses so fresh an interest, when every effort seems so certain to succeed, when the sensation of failure is yet a thing unknown. And such a doctrine as they had to preach, and such a Master as they had to proclaim as the coming King! The world had never yet heard a message like His Gospel of universal peace and love, nor seen a being like Himself. What could there be before them but rapid and complete victory?

So they had gone forth to their first independent effort, and from it they had just returned. They came back, as we may all imagine if we reflect a little again, with an immense deal to tell. No child, that returns to its mother from a visit, more overflowing with talk than they. "They told Him all things, both what they had done and what they had taught." Here they had met an open and truthful mind; and what a pleasure it had been to instruct and encourage him! Here they had found a repentant, yet desponding sinner; and how they had delighted to bind up his broken heart, and to send him on his way rejoicing! And here they had encountered a captious gainsayer; and with what a clever repartee they had answered and silenced his objections! And what a ready hearing, and how much success their words and efforts had obtained! Such things they, no doubt, related, with a great deal of simple ingenuous pride. They can hardly have failed to have told their Master another thing, which the Seventy, who were sent out afterwards, reported, when they too returned—what mighty works they had done in His name. Nor would they fail to receive some such reply, half encouragement and half caution, as that which the Seventy received: "I beheld Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven; notwithstanding, in this rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven." You can imagine much being said like this by that Master, still young Himself, and therefore naturally, as well as supernaturally, sympathising with the hopefulness of youth, cautious not to depress zeal, even while correcting its extravagance. "Yes," He said, "the Spirit of good is stronger than the spirit of evil. Yes, Satan is falling from his high place of power, and he will fall. But do not boast of spiritual power; do not be exalted by spiritual success; rejoice, rather, that there is a place for all faithful labourers, the unsuccessful as well as the successful, in the dwelling of their Lord. When bright hopes are all faded, when success has turned to failure, when high gifts have deserted their former possessors, there will still remain for you a refuge and a home." At the same time there came those words of kindly invitation which the text contains: "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile." They were, in fact, to go with their Master and enjoy a well-earned holiday.

And so they embarked on the calm bosom of the Sea of Galilee and raised their sail; and the light airs began to draw them off the land, slowly and dreamily, towards the lonelier country of the eastern side. There, let us think, are the thirteen upon the lake — the crew of twelve, each one of whom is an apostle, and the Captain, whom almost all now admit to have been the ideal Man, whom we believe to have been God manifest in the flesh. Fresh airs are breathing on the weary brows; bright waters are rippling under the vessel's floor; an open sky is bending over them, boundless as that love of God which they have been proclaiming; no shadow of approaching horrors has yet fallen on them, and all hearts are free and joyous, for not even Judas is a traitor yet.

This invitation of our Lord is often felt to be specially suited to the season of Lent. Let us take it next in that point of view. Suppose Him to be saying to us, "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile." It was, as we have seen already, a temporary retirement from a life of active labour, to which our Lord invited His disciples. It is as such a retirement that the season of Lent is offered to us. Let us ask, first, Are such retirements useful? and, specially, Is the retirement of Lent, which is so pressingly recommended to us by pulpit addresses, and by distribution of tracts and papers, of any practical spiritual use?

This is a question which, I doubt not, has been often present to the more thoughtful minds. Such are never content with a mere outward form, but

are impelled by an irresistible impulse to press inward and grasp the reality of all things. They have often tried to make Lent real and practical to themselves, and perhaps they cannot yet boast of very much success. Let such try again, and perhaps their renewed efforts may obtain a fuller blessing.

They will have seen already that Lent is the combination of two ideas—retirement and abstinence—retirement, typified by our Saviour's sojourn in the wilderness, and abstinence by His fast of forty days.

Many will have had their attention most drawn by the abstemious side. They have meditated, over and over again, on the Collect that we use on the first Sunday, "Give us grace that we may use such abstinence, that the flesh being subdued to the spirit, we may ever obey Thy godly motions in righteousness and true holiness." And it has occurred to them that the words are something like an hypocrisy on their lips, if they have used no abstinence, and made no efforts to subdue the flesh, and so to obtain an answer to their prayer.

Perhaps they may have gone on to reflect on current modes of abstinence—to quote one example—on the ancient ceremonial fish, and it has appeared to them that no help towards a victory of the spirit over the flesh can be obtained through such changes of diet, or through the observance of any other outward though time-honoured ceremony. Perhaps they may have at times gone further, and attempted severer abstinence, either by putting away for the time all pleasant foods and drinks, or by considerably diminishing the quantity, or by refusing to themselves their own particular favourite indulgences. And then possibly the more observant minds may have made this strange experience, that such abstinence does not tend to subdue the flesh to the spirit, nor to spiritualise the thoughts and impulses, but that sometimes the effect of such austerity seems to be to transfer the sensuality from the body to the mind. It is a fact that bodily abstinence often has that effect. A person deprived of water dreams of running streams, one debarred from food is tormented by the pangs of hunger, and the thought of eating is never absent from his mind; or, if suddenly deprived of accustomed stimulant or narcotic, a longing for the missing indulgence occupies the thoughts and the imagination. Great ascetics have often complained that they were haunted by carnal thoughts and imaginations far above the average of other men. Men like Antony the hermit, or Jerome, the first great literary advocate of a monastic life, have recorded that, however much they strove to mortify their flesh, they could not prevent their cells from being the scenes of most luxurious visions. They themselves attributed these temptations to the devil, but the much more probable cause was their own mismanagement of their own bodies. They did not see that the less a person thinks of carnal things the shorter time such things dwell upon his mind, the more the supply of the needs of the animal man is allowed to pass as a mere matter of course, the more intellectual and the more spiritual is he likely to become.

Are we then to conclude that, since slight changes of diet have no moral influence at all, and severe privation tends to carnalise the thoughts and feelings, therefore the abstinence of Lent is a thing of the past, whose substance and utility has departed, and which may safely be dismissed to the limbo of institutions, which have done their work and had their day?

This would be advancing too fast and too far. Abstinence has its place in the moral system of Christ, though He does not permit it to rank among the weightier matters of the law. And it is still more prominent in the practice, if not in the teaching, of His Apostles. The most striking thing with regard to the Gospel treatment of this subject is the immense divergence and variety of example that we find in the practice of the highest authorities, and the consequent latitude that they sanction in our own practice. There is only time for the very slightest sketch of this variety. Our Lord fasted the forty days in the wilderness, of which Lent is the remembrance, giving thereby an example both of abstinence and of retirement. Yet in the great three years in which He taught and saved the world, He and His followers were a most striking example of non-ascetic life. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and it was noted of His disciples that they fasted not. Nevertheless when he was discussing, in His Sermon on the Mount, the pre-existing religious practices of the Jews, He did not treat this particular one of fasting as an usage which must now come to an end, but gave rules, according to which it might even be so practised as to receive a reward from our Father in heaven. And, after His departure, we find all His disciples, not only those who, like Paul, had had a pharisaical education, but the simple Galilean Simon Peter, and the prophets and teachers from various quarters assembled at Antioch, who ordained Paul and Barnabas, ministering to the Lord and fasting.

We find, both in the Lord's own words and in those of Paul, the principles which justify all this latitude of practice. According to the Lord Himself there are, among the children of wisdom, ascetics like John the Baptist, and non-ascetics like Himself; and Wisdom, their mother, approves them both. According to St. Paul the principle which should govern all the practice is that the body, as well as the spirit, is the Lord's, and must be ruled for Him. The detail of the practice he treats as a matter resting entirely between the individual and God, in the regulating of which two rules must be observed, that every man should be thoroughly persuaded in his own mind that what he does is right, and that no man should judge his

brother. Abstinence must be used by each, as far as he judges that it conduces to his edification, so as to make his body, as well as his spirit, more truly and really the Lord's. Both the Lord and the disciple treat it as distinctly a personal and individual thing, depending, like every other matter of diet, on bodily constitution, which last differs so much in different subjects, that one *regimen* can hardly suit two individuals.

In view of this teaching of individual liberty, shall we say that a fixed period of abstinence, like that of Lent, is a thing of the past? I think not, unless we can say that intemperance and sensuality are also things of the past. And that surely we cannot say. There is too much of these evil things to be found still amongst all ranks and classes of mankind. My own lot has been to minister to the less educated and civilised classes, to whom strong liquors are the greatest existing temptation. Amongst these I have found Lent to be an admirable opportunity for renewing efforts to overcome their own besetting sin. To them the fast from alcoholic liquors is obviously the one acceptable to the Lord. Nor can it be doubted that there is a great deal of coarse heavy luxury still to be found even in that section of the world, which esteems itself the most refined. Nor, perhaps, is there one amongst us, whose habits need no improvement in any of that range of subjects which we describe as sensual, such as food, drink, stimulants, amusements, indolence, sleep, etc. Some also might inquire with profit into the scale of their entertainments, are they ostentatious, extravagant, foolishly luxurious? or are they simply directed to the proper objects of all Christian festivities, which are diffusing good feeling, and promoting happiness? And there are still deeper recesses of the animal man into which, though we cannot discuss them, our consciences must not shrink from inquiring. Surely there is ample scope here for denial, and even mortification (*i.e.*, deadening) of the flesh. Though the mode and measure of the abstinence is free to every man, yet every one that is Christ's must have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. And the solemn periodical reminder of this often neglected and forgotten duty is not without its use.

But whatever our personal rule be with regard to any Lenten abstinence, there is one point which every one must remember, or else his Lenten observances sink into a mere hypocrisy. The aim of all such must be to effect a solid improvement, which may endure after the forty days are past. It is of no use contenting ourselves during Lent with the scanty, but wholesome, food of the desert, if we return to the flesh-pots of Egypt on Easter Day. It is no use invading our enemy's country, with solemn hymns pealing, and the banners of Christ flying, merely to display the force we can put into the field for a few weeks, and to maintain our prestige as professing Christians, if we intend all the while to evacuate the conquered territory by a quiet capitulation as soon as Lent is over. Our object must be to establish a sort of "scientific frontier" between ourselves and all future invasions of sensuality, such as we are positively determined to hold hereafter, by God's help, against all comers. And this, if I am not mistaken, is the missing point in most of the ascetic observances of the present day. People have not the clear and firm resolution to maintain their advance, but intend to retreat when the period is over, and be just as they were before—no better; and well for them if they are no worse.

We have been dwelling long to-day on the mere animal side of Christian morality. It is, no doubt, the least elevated, and the least spiritual of all the subjects on which Scripture treats. And it may seem to some as if, in treating it, we had raised about our meditations a culinary and alcoholic smell, like that of some dining-room, that has lately been the scene of a ponderous repast. Let us escape to the shores of the Sea of Galilee, for the air is purer, and thought is sweeter and more wholesome there. Our text spoke of retirement, not of abstinence; on that subject we began, and on that let us conclude.

The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, neither indulgence in these things, nor abstinence from them, nor distinctions drawn between the different kinds of them—the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. It is the retirement of Lent, which enables busy people to occupy themselves with these higher themes. And thus, of the two ideas which the season embodies, the retirement is a greater and better thing than the abstinence.

Let us hear then once more our Saviour's invitation, "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile." It was from diligent labours for the good of souls that those disciples were invited to seek a temporary refuge. How much more needful must it be to seek such occasional retirements from the present hurrying world? God made the world—the world of society as well as the world of nature. Even this rapid world of the end of the nineteenth century has come into existence through His providence. The great Steersman has not abandoned the helm, but is guiding it, through all the cross currents and changing winds, to noble objects of His own. The evil in it is not original, and (happier still) it is not inseparable. It is of His ordering that we live our lives, in close and frequent communion with those fellow-creatures of ours who form our world, for their good and for our own. *In* the world though not *of* the world, our Lord bade His disciples be. Nevertheless, in the world certain evils happen to us, for which occasional retirement is the cure. Let us look at one or two of these, for which we seek a remedy.

I. The world confuses our self-knowledge. The source of self-knowledge is reflection; and little reflection is possible amid the bustle of the world. It happens to us, as to the disciples in the Gospel—there are many coming and going—employers, customers, clients, patients, parishioners, as the case may be. The trade, or business, or profession, occupies nearly all our time. Family affairs often cause anxiety. Public business—politics, religion, charity—all solicit attention, which must be given from time to time. A hundred persons have to be spoken to, a hundred subjects considered. As soon as one business is dispatched, another comes to be transacted. Well for us, if we can keep them distinct and separate, and not mix and muddle them all. All these are outside of our real selves, so that the mind engaged in them acquires an outward leaning, and seldom collects itself inwardly at all. So reflection perishes, and with it self-knowledge. The cure of this is retirement, to which Lent invites us. It says, "Get you into your closet and shut the door—you that have leisure, as long as you are able—you that are overwhelmed with business, for the few hours or minutes that you have at your command. The season is a great benefit if so used. And we have another such, which we do not sufficiently appreciate, in our insular Sundays, which are so much ridiculed by foreigners, and which some at home are beginning to think an intolerable burden. These are great spiritual advantages: do not let us lose them, but use them for the special object of retaining or regaining some little knowledge of ourselves.

II. Another danger is that, during our intercourse with the world, our wishes and objects grow more and more worldly, that is, they become confined and bounded by this present world. We cease to feel our own immortality, we cease to have intercourse with God, and then all our aims insensibly decline. Conscience and duty become less and less our rule. We are more and more guided by self-interest or personal inclination; and by even worse things, covetousness, ambition, revenge, our motives sinking gradually, so that we cannot tell when or how they change. It is in retirement that we must resist and repair declines like these.

III. The last evil that I will name to-day, whose proper remedy is retirement, is irritation. Many things occur to ruffle and disturb. We become vexed and displeased, perhaps with actual enemies, perhaps with indifferent people, perhaps with our best friends. This is sure to be so. For all are sinful; and our respective faults and failings jar against each other. Besides, all are short-sighted and imperfectly informed, and therefore we often mistake and misunderstand.

For all these inward disturbances, the remedy is, as has been said, retirement and reflection; and, as the highest of all authorities has taught us, the closet is the place where that remedy is to be applied. It naturally occurs to us to inquire whether the profusion of ceremonies and addresses, with which it is now usual and fashionable to employ Lent, are quite according to the Master's mind. Are not these bustles and excitements near akin to the bustles and excitements of the world? Do they not encourage the faulty habit of seeking the kingdom of God here or there, from this preacher, or from that ceremony, instead of seeking it, as we were taught, within? Do they not occupy the time, which as the Lord told us, should be spent alone, with the Father who is in secret? Do they not squander upon distractions, which are more than half amusements, that precious strength, which should be expended in winning spiritual improvement by a close personal hold on God?

Let us take the invitation in the text as a call not to excitement, but to retirement, "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile." Enter into your closet and shut to the door, and pray to your Father which is in secret. Lay yourselves in the arms of Jesus; throw yourselves open to the eye of all-seeing God. There breathe forth the wish, "That which I see not teach thou me; if I have done iniquity, I will do no more." Your Father will teach you; He will guide your feet into the way of peace.

Thus, I think, Lent becomes practical, and its invitation carries with it a sweet and soothing sound.

Return, return,
From strife and tumult vain,
To quiet solitude,
And silent thought again.
Then the storms shall sink to rest
That now war within thy breast;
Then the Spirit, long neglected,
Waits with joys before unknown,
And the Saviour, long rejected,
Claims and seals thee for His own.

IN MEMORIAM WILLIAM HENRY BURROWS.

By the Rev. C. W. Furse, Curate of Westminster, formerly Canon of Christ Church, St. Pancras.

Sermon Preached in Christ Church, Albany Street, N.W., on Sunday, January 31st, 1892.

"And unto man He said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding."—Job xxviii. 28.

I. I AM here this evening by the affectionate command of those who have a right to call me. There are friends here of Henry William Burrows who wish to think of him in his old church to-night; and the opportunity offered me of speaking on this theme is mine only because they have confidence in me that I am his friend. There is

no need of apology for making him our Sunday theme. His life was a sermon; his name is a text; his character preaches; his example teaches us a good deal of the best we know.

In conformity with custom I have chosen also a motto from the Bible; and happily it comes naturally in this evening's service from the Book of Job. Happily I say, for everything in that book is great—great thoughts, great strength, great patience, great suffering, great imagination, great sense of responsibility, great views of life, death, man, and God. Christian men have their characteristic signatures as well as Hebrew saints; and if you think of him as I do you will understand my saying that in Henry Burrows there was not anything, except his stature, which was not great. If constant labour in the service of God without remission of a resolute intention, if intense study of the whole duty of man through a long life, if a passionless will, a purity as white as snow, but, unlike snow, impenetrable by corruption, a perfect simplicity and entire immunity from ambition, a righteousness as chivalrous as a Bayard against wrong, and a protest against all profanity as meek and invincible as the silver shield of a child's innocence—if these virtues be not only good, but great, then Henry Burrows had many elements of a great man. But in this church and parish, the witness of his work in the best twenty-seven years of his manhood, you will wish me to recall more in detail the special features of his character.

II. The congregation of Christ Church had been shocked and shattered by the breaking of a mighty wave, which, rising from the deep waters of the Oxford movement, dashed down with great force on the altar of this church, and flooded the worshippers with fear. To the honour of a valiantly strong and self-denying, but eccentric man, of whose early life at Eton and at Oxford I was a witness, I recall the testimony of Maria Rossetti (herself no mean judge of character) that Edward Stuart, then a curate in this church stemmed the tide, and with undaunted courage rallied the fainting hearts of the congregation, and patiently stood firm at his post. In due time Henry Burrows entered upon the scene. It was a task that claimed not brilliancy and enthusiasm so much as reality of character, judgment, moderation, consistency, and wisdom. He found parishioners, dismayed and scattering, going hither and thither and nowhither, but also found a faithful group of steady men and women, of whom "some are fallen asleep" and some "remain until now." To the remnants of this faithful band I look with perfect confidence, believing that in this brief review of Henry Burrows's character I have their sympathy, while in their own steadfast life and Christian principles appears the best monument of their pastor's influence. Christ Church was never, as I knew it thirty years ago, a fashionable church. I hope it is not now. But there was in it a solid stamp of sober reverence, before the days of ritualism, a plain, frugal, simple, manly Christianity out of doors, and a tenderness of devotion, with holy reserve, at the altar within. Those who had a right to judge ascribed with generous affiance these excellent traditions to Mr. Dodsworth, who was a great teacher, but they were preserved and deepened by the godliness of Henry Burrows, and are perpetuated, I trust, to the present hour.

III. At this point I pause to note the value of such a Church in the history of this age. We that are old must be hopeful and thankful for the young. The Holy Spirit Who receives of Christ, and brings to the Church, develops fresh aspects of the old truth. It is so in doctrine, in ritual, and in various practices and efforts of the Church to meet new wants. With all the mistakes made by older and younger men, yet by God's good will the tide keeps flowing in, and the high-water-mark is advanced. But it is not all gold that glitters. There is reason to watch with some carefulness, if not anxiety, such phenomena as these in the present time—viz., an increasing tendency to fashion in churches where Catholic Christianity is upheld; the habit of obtrusive and rival advertisements; the excessive multiplication of offices and services, obviously intended not for the men of work and action, but for persons who, if they do not indulge in the luxury of idle hours, are rich at least in a superfluity of leisure; and to minister to these (if it be called ministering) an excessive number of assistant curates are wanted, while at the same time other parishes, not in east and south London only, but elsewhere, are fighting their way against poverty and ignorance close at hand, and must be content to receive the curates and choirs which Dives leaves. Again, there is surely a danger of parish priests, supposing that because they are filled with generous ardour to minister to the necessities of the poor, they are excused the brain-work, and study, and culture, and mental power which with spiritual influence uppermost and undermost furnishes the equipment for the work of preachers and teachers to men and women of higher education. In the activities of this noble work for the poor we should pause to think what will become of the Church's influence on the scholars, and merchants, and lawyers, and business men of London—not to speak of the hard-headed artisan, the passionate politician, and the cultivated women who are our novelists and reviewers, if young men are encouraged to seek the priesthood exclusively with an eye to missions to the poor and to the development of ritual, without one thought of their mental capacity for gaining the ear and winning the conscience of the man of letters and of trade.

Now, Henry Burrows was for the thirty years I knew him (and some of you have known him longer than this) a silent, modest, temperate protest against all these questionable phases of the Church.

IV. This, happily, brings me back to my theme.

Your dear parish priest was in his own person a scholar and a student. It was his principle, his rule of conscience, to learn, and read, and think. It was wonderful to see how closely he kept to the track. What was a time for talk and tattle for others was an occasion of study to him. When any man was present to teach him anything there Henry Burrows stood to learn. Years ago I remember a young clergyman coming up to me at a Fulham garden-party and saying suddenly, "I have great respect for your vicar." "I am glad you have," I said, "it shows your sense—but why?" "Why, there I watch him when the Bishop brings any missionary to speak to a group of guests, with paper in hand, giving his whole mind to it, saying not a word, but taking in all he hears and writing down the speech. He seems never to forget his work!" One of the ablest men I have ever known told me once, "The greatest pleasure in the world is to listen to a man who can teach me. The next greatest pleasure is to teach another who will listen to be taught."

Your teacher would rather have been called a student than a scholar, simply because study he felt to be a duty as a preparation for his work for God. But he was a scholar too; and is it not poetical justice—nay, much more—a dear reward to the Father, from the kindness of God, that he should live to see his youngest son a great scholar, even, I suppose, greater than himself?

V. Then as a preacher, when he gave out to you what with such study and life-habit he had taken in, what shall I say of him? He was excelled by many in some of the accidents of a public speaker. There was a certain dryness and brittleness in voice and word. He was not a popular preacher, thank God; but his preaching was always good, at most times excellent, and not rarely splendid and magnificent. You have heard him, some of you, from the old pulpit, when he rose to a vision of the Incarnation, when the best that was human and all that was Divine in him went up in a rushing flame of eloquence, the fiery, lambent tongue licking the golden steps of the Throne of the Glorified Manhood of Jesus, the Saviour and the King, the Incarnate Son of God! Then his voice had volume, his very stature rose to greatness, and with uplifted hand he bowed us all to worship the humanity of Christ. But yet it was not thus that he made his mark as a preacher of the Word. His characteristic grace, as I have always thought it, was his delicate perception in discussing Christian ethics, his subtlety of movement as he analysed character and discerned the true and the false, and with finest touch unfolded the golden foil leaf by leaf upon which the finger of God the Holy Spirit had traced, with infinite variety, the beauty of the human soul. In this faculty of the preacher I have known him compared to Newman, the great master of the art, and the comparison was true. A great living writer, not a Christian, is speaking of one, a pure and chastened man, destined for an early death, who won young men "less by argument than by the gracious attraction of virtue in his own character." He goes on to say: "The stock moralist, like the common-place orator of the pulpit, fails to touch the hearts of men, or to affect their lives, for lack of delicacy of sympathy and of freshness; he attempts to compensate for this by excess of emphasis, and that more often disgusts us than persuades." Few men I have ever heard had that grace of delicacy more perfect than Henry Burrows.

VI. Forgive me if I notice one more characteristic of our dear friend. There is physical beauty, and mental beauty, and moral beauty. The first touches us through our senses, and so we speak, with no unkindly word, of sensuous beauty. I used to think Henry Burrows had little or none of this. In this realm of beauty he was, perhaps unconsciously, an ascetic, the plainest, most frugal, most simple being you could ever see. But in the perception of mental beauty his taste was exquisite, fine, subtle, rich in delight. I suppose no man was ever more remote from the tolerance of anything that was vulgar or out of taste. It was here his poetry came out, though the usual vehicle of his thoughts was simple prose. In the absence of a sensuous perception of beauty, and in the culture of mental and moral beauty, the beauty which comes through the imagination, and the image thrown upon the conscience by the beauty of holiness, he appears to me almost unique.

VII. But now, dear old friends, and younger hearers, the last, the best has to be said. Compared to the traits of beauty in the scholar, the student, and the preacher, his greatness in goodness, as an example of Christian life, is what Job calls wisdom and understanding, weighed against the corals and the pearls, the topaz and the rubies, which his imagination fetches from the world of beauty in nature's realm. "The supremacy of goodness," which Dean Church in his noble sermon bearing that title calls it—the godly character which our blessed Lord notes in His parable of the merchantman seeking goodly pearls, who parts with them all at last for the one pearl of great price—this is the last, and the best that can be said of any man. I should not have been so generously asked to speak to you in your church of Henry Burrows were it not that his goodness and righteousness justifies our making solemn mention of his honoured name. "Unto man He said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding." The impression of our parish priest made on every one was the character of godliness, righteous hatred of evil, truth and star-like honesty, absolute, simple, intrepid obedience to the sovereignty of God. The worldly man feared him, for his holiness was severe. The double-minded man trembled before him. The half-hearted envied him. The honest learner and the timid disciple trusted him. The supremacy of

goodness was his principle of life. Service for God was his rest in toil. We pray, and know assuredly, that his rest in the grave is for him life, eternal life with God.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1892.

THE NEWMAN MEMORIAL AT OXFORD.

THE Duke of Norfolk has done what he ought to have done long ago—and has, on behalf of the Newman Memorial Committee, withdrawn the acceptance of the very inappropriate site suggested at Oxford. Better late than never. Why the Duke, who is known to be an excellent man of business, did not see the true facts of the case at the outset is a mystery, we can only suppose that sectarian feeling was allowed for the moment to overcome plain common sense.

The controversy, thus happily closed, suggests two or three reflections. We protest against the growing habit of abusing people who do their duty, for their want of taste. The gentlemen of culture and position who headed the protest against the unwise decision of the Oxford councillors in committee have been abused as fanners of sectarian flames, and as violators of the respect due to the great dead—both utterly unfair accusations. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* is a good maxim—so long as the dead are dead. But when they come to life again, when bitter memories and half-forgotten injuries are kindled once more by the hasty actions of the dead man's foolish friends, then men cannot hold their peace. A good man may keep silence about the dead, even under a deep sense of injury, but he cannot maintain silence when his generosity is taken advantage of to magnify a character he cannot admire, and a career of strenuous hostility to all that he loves and cherishes. And as to sectarianism, the promoters of the memorial were themselves the sectarians, whatever may have been the action of a few generous men, the bulk of the subscribers were zealous and jealous sectarians, and showed their motives plainly in eagerly catching at the site suggested, and striving to hold on to it in the face of protests which must have given pause to men of better taste. Alongside the desire to do honour to Newman lay the wish to snatch, as it were, a great sectarian victory by erecting a statue of a distinguished deserter from the Anglican ranks in the very heart of a city consecrated to the cause of the Reformation, breathing the very air of martyrdom. To acquit them of the motive would be to argue them ignorant of the past and blind to the present. The charges of sectarianism and want of courtesy and taste, we rebut upon the accusers.

The promoters of the memorial must now look about for some other place, the one they choose is largely a matter of indifference, so long as no further attempt is made to elevate a sectarian partisan into a national hero. For it is as well to remember, amid all this great clamour, now, fortunately, dying away, that Newman was not in any sense a man of national renown. To Roman Catholics he is the personification of a great, though temporary, sectarian triumph, and a magnificent, but quite groundless ambition; to a small and diminishing circle he is a brilliant reminiscence of great personal influence, charming eloquence and bright promise, of suddenly arrested development; to the rest of the nation he is scarcely a name, and a name associated with no great constructive work, with no abiding influence on national life and character, only representing a disappointment and a puzzle. Compare the national part played by Spurgeon and by Newman, and who comes out as the national hero? And yet even the universal sorrow at Spurgeon's death has not admitted the overbearing claims asserted by the Cardinal's commemorators.

The moral of the whole affair is, not to be in a hurry about memorials to dead men. The pathos of a death-bed is a great quickener of sympathies, and a marvellous cloud to the judgment. To our mind, a generation ought to elapse before anything of the nature of a public commemoration should take place of any one about whom there was not national unanimity. It is only after the lapse of years that we are able to accurately place a man—it will be something gained if Cardinal Newman's rather rash admirers and supporters have at last learned this lesson.

THE *Durham County Advertiser* understands that Dean Cowie has left to join Dean Lake at Cannes, and that he will remain there for some six weeks, in the hope that the change and rest may have a beneficial effect on his health.

WILLIAM REEVES, LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

The "Prayer Book" Churchman.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, D.D., Rector of Warrenpoint, Author of "The Church of St. Patrick," "Ireland since the Reformation," "Ireland since the Union," etc.

(*Continued from page* 107.)

V.

The Conscientious Bishop.

During the next eleven years, from 1875 to 1886, the Library of Armagh formed the principal scene of his labours, until the 18th March, 1886, when he was elected *ad interim* Bishop of Armagh and Clogher. When, however, Robert Knox, Lord Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore, was chosen Primate of all Ireland by the Bench of Bishops, Dr. Reeves, in accordance with the new Constitution of the Church, succeeded, as a matter of course, to the vacant see, and was consecrated Bishop in Armagh Cathedral, on St. Peter's Day, June 29th, 1886. The sermon was preached by the Venerable W. Meade, Archdeacon of Armagh, and one paragraph deserves notice here. "We, in this diocese of Armagh, know well and love well him who has been called to rule over the great metropolis of the north. We are well assured that in learning and intellectual ability, he is no unworthy successor of the great men who have gone before him. He is no stranger in that diocese; he returns to the scene of his early labours; but for four-and-twenty years he has lived amongst us, he has gone in and out amongst us, and we looked upon him as our own. To-day we part from him with much sorrow and many prayers. To-day, many loving hearts are gathered around him, and many a holy aspiration has gone up to the Throne of Grace that his episcopate may be blessed to the glory of God and the good of His Church." On the same day Dr. Stack was consecrated Bishop of Clogher. The service was one of peculiar interest. The new Bishops were consecrated by the present Primate, and amongst those who took part in the ceremony were—the Bishop of Meath (Dr. Reichel); the Bishop of Ossory (Dr. Walsh); and Dr. Shone, Bishop of Kilmore. On entering upon his duties as bishop of this diocese, he was cordially received. The Diocesan Council presented an address of welcome:—"We recall with unaffected pleasure your Lordship's former connection with this united diocese, first as curate-assistant of Lisburn, and afterwards as incumbent of Kirkinriola, and we simply express what we all feel, when we add that we regard your association with us during so many of the earlier years of your ministry, as a diocesan distinction. It is a source of special gratification to us to note that your Lordship is not merely a friend of long standing, but one to whom the monuments of our ecclesiastical literature are not only familiar but dear, and that you have illustrated and enriched our national history by original researches of great and permanent value. As chaplain to our late revered Primate, you have a long and varied administrative experience, and we anticipate for your Lordship a distinguished episcopate. We have only to add that, in all your efforts to strengthen and develop Church life in this united diocese, your Lordship may command our loyal and cordial co-operation, and we pray that the Divine blessing may accompany you in all your labours."

During his episcopate he took the deepest interest in the welfare of the diocese. His confirmation addresses were models of what such addresses should be, simple, clear and pointed. He did not water down the ordinance to suit weak palates, but laid stress on it as a means of grace and blessing to such as duly received it and with faith sought a blessing therein. He laid hands reverently on each person, and produced on all present the impression that he believed in the rite, and that to him it was a reality and not a form. He consecrated churches which had been built, or enlarged and beautified, and on each occasion he delivered addresses which contained valuable matter dealing with the history, not only of the church, but of the district in which it was situated.

The opening years of his episcopate were clouded by ill-health, which produced great depression of spirits. The change from the calm seclusion of Armagh Library to the busy capital of the North, full of eager life, hard practical difficulties, and burning questions, was a serious thing for one who had already passed the allotted three-score years and ten, and the strain told heavily. But his mind soon recovered its natural buoyancy, and he devoted himself not only to the task of bringing his edition of the Book of Armagh to completion, but also to the duties of his office.

In 1890 Dr. Reeves enjoyed the great pleasure of entertaining the Lord Bishop of Salisbury and Mrs. Wordsworth, and of pointing out to them some of the points of interest connected with Ireland. Naturally, he took them to see the ruins in the neighbourhood of Drogheda, a locality rich in antiquarian associations, from Mellifont Abbey, founded in 1142 A.D., to the sword of King William, preserved as an heirloom in the family of Blayney Balfour, Esq., of Townley Hall. The following letter relates the impression left by the visit on the mind of the Bishop of Salisbury:—

"Palace, Salisbury,
"23rd February, 1892.

"My Dear Sir,—I have been for some days looking for your kind letter of the 8th, which I had mislaid. I am sorry to have so long kept you waiting for an answer. Nothing would have given me greater pleasure than to write my recollections of the very pleasant and profitable days which we spent in June, 1890, with my kind friend, the late Bishop of Down and Connor; but, alas! I kept no notes of our journey. I can only remember the general impression of his kindness and stimulating companionship at all points of it, in Dublin, on our journey northwards, and in his own home and neighbourhood. In Dublin I had the advantage of seeing the treasures of the Royal Irish Academy under his guidance—probably the best possible. He accompanied us, starting at quite an early hour, all through a long day's excursion from Drogheda, in which his spirit and untiring brightness were perfectly wonderful, and quite equal to his learning, which you know was immense in all the departments of Irish ecclesiastical history and antiquities. We visited in his company, three typical fragments of the past, the curious bee hive burial-place of New Grange into which he crawled like a young man, certainly on rugs, kindly supplied to us by his pleasant friends, Mr. and Miss Balfour, the round tower and churchyard of Monasterboice, and the ruins of Mellifont Abbey, and talked of many similar excursions

which we hoped to make in other days. In his own home at Conway House, Dunmurry, he was a delightful host, and made me acquainted with many books that I had not previously seen, ending up with the valuable gift of his own, Adamnan's 'Life of Columba,' which I need not say is a very scarce book. We visited of course Lisburn and Belfast together, and parted with great regret. I trust that his books and MSS. will pass into loving and intelligent hands.

"His son (Major Reeves) has kindly written to me about the 'Book of Armagh,' which he had copied and intended to edit. I am anxious also about the 'Book of Hymms,' of which the third part certainly could easily be finished with the help of his MSS. If anything could be done to secure it for the Irish Academy or Trinity College, the labour would be well spent. I must not attempt to write more. You will put in the name of the burial-place, which at this moment I forget.

"I am, dear Sir,
"Faithfully yours,
"JOHN SARUM.

"Rev. Dr. NAYLOR."

The Bishop enjoyed the visit quite as much as his guests. A few weeks later, in July, 1890, meeting one of his clergy in Belfast by appointment, he suggested, when their business was finished, that instead of waiting for a train, they should walk back to Dunmurry, a distance of several miles, which they accordingly did, and the remembrance of that walk is not likely to be effaced by time.

Dr. Reeves was evidently a believer in Fuller's maxim that "harmless mirth is the best cordial against the consumption of the spirits," but though he was an inveterate punster, his wit never took the form of ill-nature and never degenerated into levity. He was not one of that class who "think their conceits like mustard not good except they bite." It is said that when a friend remonstrated with a certain witty Dublin Dean for some brilliant witticism in the General Synod, he replied, "If people only knew how I try *not* to say witty things," and doubtless the late Bishop sometimes found it no easy matter to curb the inclination to be humorous. Take for example the following:—When the family vault was opened to receive the remains of the late Primate, and orders had been given to exclude the representatives of the Press, he is said to have checked the rush of the gentlemen of the pen, remarking grimly: "*Press out, gentlemen, Press out.*"

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." March, 1892. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

CANON CHEYNE continues his review of Dr. Driver's introduction in the same style and manner as last month's paper. Even if Canon Cheyne's theories should prove true—and they are sufficiently startling, the Book of Jonah "like that of Esther, contains an element of mythic symbol," the books of Joel and Zechariah, are both post exilic, etc., etc. yet nothing can excuse the flippant and thoughtless tone of such papers as these, which is exactly that of the mad man of the Book of Proverbs who scattereth firebrands and saith, Am I not in sport. There are problems and difficulties enough already, weighing down and perplexing thinking men, making that saying of Thomas à Kempis, "truly it is trial enough even to love upon the earth," sadly too true, without the further addition of having, what to many of us are of the very foundation of the faith, and even essential to holding the Divinity of Christ, thus rudely assailed. We sincerely hope that "To be concluded," means that there will be only one more such paper.

Dr. Beet ends his paper on the Atonement with a very interesting sentence—"Why it was needful that, in order to save men from the due consequences of their own sins, Christ should die, the documents we have examincd [*i.e.*, the Synoptists, St. John and St. Peter] do not teach. They thus prompt a question more pressing and difficult than those which they answer. For an answer to this question, we shall turn to the teaching of one who, so far as we can judge, understood the mystery of the Agony upon the Cross much better than did the disciples who were with Christ in the Garden, better even than did the beloved Apostles who saw Him on the Cross. In our next paper I shall endeavour to expound the all-important teaching of the Epistle to the Romans." Is then the theory of a disciple more helpful than the actual words of the Master? We think Dr. Beet is taking up a very questionable position.

The other two papers are by Dr. Sanday on the Johannean Question, and by Mr. G. A. Smith.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." March, 1892. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

WHAT has interested us most this month is the information as to use of the Revised Version given by various head-masters. The head-masters of Christ's Hospital and K. E. S., Birmingham, still use the A.V., but encourage boys to consult and have the R.V. The head-master of Dulwich goes wholly for the R.V., so does the head-master of Marlborough.

The head-masters of Shrewsbury, Haileybury, Wellington, and some others speak favourably of the R.V. for teaching purposes, but are much less strong in their opinions. On the whole the verdict of the head-masters is for the R.V.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CARDINAL NEWMAN A PLAGIARIST.

SIR,—Some months ago (October 3rd, 1891) I startled some of your readers by informing them that Dr. Newman was not the original deviser of the ingenious method of explaining away the sense of the 39 Articles exhibited in Tract 90. Being away from home at that time, I could not give the exact title of the book in which a Roman Catholic friar had anticipated the future Cardinal, and since my return illness has, till now, prevented me searching for it. I have now found the volume, and hasten to communicate its title, its author, and its general drift. It is on the back lettered:—"Sancta Clara on the Articles of the Anglican Church," and its title page (at least its material part, for it is rather long) is, "Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ: The Articles of the Anglican

Church paraphrastically considered and explained. By Franciscus a Sancta Clara, S.T.P. Edited by Fred George Lee, D.C.L.," and it is published by John Hayes, Lyall Place, Eaton Square, London, 1865.

It is, of course, a reprint, containing the original Latin, with a fair translation, and a life of the author, Christopher Davenant, who became a pervert in the reign of Charles I., and played a considerable part in the intrigues with Rome which that unhappy monarch seems to have carried on through Secretary Windebank, *not* through Archbishop Laud, who appears to have known nothing about them. In Charles II.'s time Davenant was high in Court favour, and attached to the household of the Queen, in whose service he died not long before the Revolution.

The drift is, to show that there is no real difference in doctrine between the Church of Rome and the Church of England; and the reasoning, or sophistry, is the same as that of Tract 90.

The book was by no means approved at Rome in the author's lifetime. In fact, he was summoned to Rome to give account of himself concerning it; but, having powerful patronage in England at the Court, he was enabled to avoid the dangerous journey and its not improbable results. For the Court of Rome had not then learned to approve every dishonest trick used in its interests, and the Popes who reigned in his time were more sternly unbending than they have since become under the influence of the Society of Jesus.

The original, printed in 1646 in London, is scarce, but copies of it are certain to be found in the Bodleian, if not in the British Museum.

I think it is instructive in various ways to compare the tactics pursued in those days, and those which are practised with more success in ours. King James the Second did not, as Lord Macaulay constantly assumes, wish to *destroy* the Church. He never pillaged it, as his pious predecessors, Edward the Sixth and Elizabeth, had done without scruple. All that he wished to do was to turn it from an English and Protestant Communion into a Roman Catholic one. This he proposed to effect simply by putting Roman Catholics into its chief dignities—bishoprics, headships of houses, fellowships of colleges—satisfied that they, when established at the head-quarters of the Church, would soon turn to Romanism the clergy and the youth committed to their care. He failed for two reasons—because he went too openly and too hastily to work, and because people in those days were better educated in controversial divinity than they are now. But the very same purpose is being pursued at this time, and is in great danger of being successful, by the constant, quiet pressure of false teaching, vented with wonderful perseverance and great effrontery in certain papers, supposed to be Church papers, but really under the influence of Rome. I need not specify; your readers will have no difficulty in verifying my statements. Papers which constantly sneer at the title "Protestant," a title which Archbishop Laud claimed for himself upon the scaffold, which speak of "Catholicism" with unvarying respect, whilst any attempt to escape from its thraldom is branded as "heresy," do not deserve to lead the Church; and yet we find they do.

What will be the event God only knows. But from the strange lethargy which seems to numb this generation as to all matters of dogmatic truth and from the fashionable cant on religious subjects, it really appears as if the Church of England were rapidly drifting towards submission to that "mother and mistress of all churches" who knows no compromise, and laughs at the cringing attitude assumed by her inconsistent admirers.

C. P. M.

FAITH AS A FACULTY.

SIR,—If I do not misunderstand Mr. Sandlands' letter in your last, he makes "Faith" to be "a distinct faculty," and, as such, "the gift of God."

Undoubtedly "faith" is a faculty distinct from "fear," or "love," or "hope," and in that sense may be called "a distinct faculty." But it is a faculty with which every human being is more or less gifted by God, except babies and idiots—I was going to add, lunatics; but lunatics have generally a great deal of faith. Some of them believe themselves to be kings and queens and emperors, which they certainly could not do without faith.

I know Mr. Sandlands will say this is not the "faith" he means. But I believe it is the only faith he ought to mean when he speaks of faith as a faculty. Faith by which a man believes a truth is the very same faculty by which he, or any one else believes a lie. Faith by which a man believes in God and in Christ is the very same faculty by which he believes in his neighbour, who may be a liar, or in his physician, who may be an incompetent quack. The faith to which God appeals in the Gospel is the faith with which He has endowed every reasonable human being. It is not in the power of any human being to excuse his unbelief in Christ or His gospel, by saying that he is *minus* the faculty of faith—that "faith is the gift of God" and God has not given it to him.

But is it not said, in Eph. ii. 8, that "faith is the gift of God"? Is it not St. Paul's words in that verse that Mr. Sandlands' quotes? Most certainly St. Paul never said anything of the kind, nor any other inspired writer, there or anywhere else. What St. Paul did say was "not of ourselves, but the gift of God," is our being saved by grace through faith." If this is not sufficiently evident by "that" being neuter (τοῦτο), not feminine, as representing ἡ πίστις, it is abundantly evident when we observe that the Apostle goes on to say, "not of works." Now, to say that faith is not of works is nonsense, but to say that our being saved through faith is "not of works," is sound sense and Gospel truth. But whatever is said to be "not of works" is also said to be the "gift of God."

This is no mere hair-splitting or hypercriticism. I consider it very important. When men are told that faith as a faculty is the gift of God, they are quite ready to justify their unbelief by alleging that the faculty has not been given *them*. They go on to feel, and perhaps to say, that the God of the Gospel, in condemning them for not believing, is unjust—gathering where He has not strawn, blaming and condemning men for not using a faculty which He has withheld from them. The answer to this is to tell men that they *have* the faculty of faith, and are bound to use it towards God, as they use it freely enough towards their fellow-men. They have faith, just as they have fear, love, hope, &c. They use these faculties every day. They ought to use them towards God and Christ and the promises and threatenings of His word.

St. Paul *does* say to the Philippians (i. 29), "To you it hath been *granted* in the behalf of Christ, not only

to *believe on Him*, but also to suffer in His behalf." But this is a different thing. No man ever believed on Christ but under the influence of the grace of God given him. It is because of his carnal heart being in enmity against God that he will not believe on the Christ of God, though able and willing enough to believe on any one else. He has the power, the faculty; what he wants is the will, the disposition to rest his faith on Christ. A man cannot be blamed or condemned for not doing what he has not the power to do. He can be very fairly blamed for not doing what, though he has the *power*, he has not the *will* to do. Lay the blame on the perverted will, not on the absent faculty, and you put the saddle on the right horse, not the wrong one.

W. T. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas Vicarage, Douglas,
February 24th, 1892.

P.S.—There are, of course, instances in Scripture and elsewhere, of faith in Christ being called simply "faith"; but it is never faith as a faculty that is meant. W. T. H.

SIR,—The question respecting the nature of faith raised by your old correspondent Mr. Sandlands is well deserving of attention. One of his objects is already attained, if people would accept the truth of his observation, "that men too often try to apprehend by reason that which can only be apprehended by faith." It was well said 200 years ago by Archbishop Leighton:—"Faith elevates the soul not only above sense and sensible things, but above reason itself. As reason corrects the errors that sense might occasion, so supernatural faith corrects the errors of natural reason judging according to sense." But this is not commonly believed; and I think one cause why it is not, is the habit, which Mr. Sandlands justly considers confusing, of not making proper distinctions in speaking of faith; the habit indeed of using the word loosely. Another cause is, the non-recognition of the three-fold nature of man—body, mind, and spirit. The first two man has in common with animals in general, and to that extent man is an animal. But he is something more, he is a spiritual being. If this be not accepted it is impossible that the supernatural faith spoken of by Leighton can be accepted either.

So far I go with your correspondent. I do not follow his definitions. To start with, faith being a faculty is to assume the whole contention and something besides. We can apprehend no one of our faculties, except in its actions and by its actions; and a faculty cannot be both itself and its own action. I question, nay I dispute, that faith is properly in any sense a faculty; and as it cannot be proved to be such, the whole contention for the truth of supernatural religion to be apprehended by faith is placed in a degree of jeopardy by assuming the point. What is really a human faculty is spirit; and faith is the action of the spirit, or the outcome of that action. I only state here what I believe to be the very A B C of the subject. Kant and Coleridge may be neglected, and unfortunately they are, but they are not superseded.

Concerning biblical criticism, higher and lower, it is one thing to bring the exact unadulterated reason (I prefer to call it understanding) to bear, in the examination of our sacred books, and another thing to bring the same to bear on the supernatural truth that they contain. I think it likely that mere research and study, totally independent of religion or even reverence, may be the Providentially chosen means of placing the Bible on a higher literary pinnacle than it has yet reached. But I hardly call the random conjectures that are being thrown out about the dates of the composition of the Old Testament books, criticism. The conjecture of the second or third century origin of the Gospels, is now dropped. Very likely ten years hence no one will put any of the Psalms later than the return from Babylon.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

Septuagesima, 1892.

"IS THERE A PURGATORY?"

SIR,—"J. B." cannot proceed without help from others. He first leaned upon Jerome, then upon a certain Allin, then upon the Bishop of Manchester, and now upon Edward Beecher; as appears by the PULPIT of the 20th inst. From Beecher he learns that *aionios*, "when applied to God, has the idea of endlessness derived from Him, not from the word." This would be a burlesque of grammar, as it would make the noun qualify its adjective, and not the adjective qualify the noun. If we take Beecher's rule of "defining it by the context," we shall find that it must be taken in an unlimited sense in Matthew xxv. 46, because there is nothing in the context to limit it. It means there, in both phrases, "strictly everlasting."

Salvation is conditional upon man's repentance and faith; it is wrong, therefore, to quote texts in an absolute sense, which were meant to be taken only conditionally.

He is also wrong in making his present feelings a measure of the quality of those he may have in a future life. Abraham "viewed with calm serenity" the anguish of Dives when he called for a "drop of water." Neither is there any use in his trying to build on those feelings such a vast superstructure as "final restoration." And he ought to know that what he *says about himself* is no argument to other people.

How does he expect to have his "earnest desire of removing sin" gratified? What can he do, or what does he expect to be able to do, to "remove sin" from the soul of any man? If he can do anything in that way, why not do it *now*, and thus prevent future sufferings?

He says that "he employs his best efforts against evil of every kind," and on this account thinks it "preposterous to doubt that those who are a 'kind of firstfruits of God's creatures' will be actively engaged in the most important work that can be conceived." He does not tell us what that work is: but it cannot be that of trying to deliver people from everlasting punishment, because that would be impossible. But who are the "firstfruits"? Will none others but they be engaged in this "important work"? If so, why? "J. B." seems to know a great deal about the future life, because he says they are "*evidently* being prepared for important services." If there be these "important services" in a future life, how will "J. B." prove that bringing Dives over the "fixed, *impassable* gulf," is one of them? Mr. Murphy shifts his ground like the way the chameleon changes its colour. He says in his last that "the question of time is not raised in Matthew xxv. 46; whereas in a former letter he had said that "eternal life" there meant a "strictly

everlasting" life. As the contents of my last letter had not appeared before, it could not have been *previously* "replied to."

R. DONALDSON.

February 25th, 1892.

CANON CORNISH, vicar of St. Mary, Redcliffe, Bristol, has been appointed Assistant-Rural Dean of the rural deanery of Bristol.

THE Rev. W. Bryan-Brown, rector of Amberley, near Stroud, has resigned the living, having accepted a permanent post on the Parochial Mission staff.

THE Rev. Owen Jones, vicar of Pentrevoelas, Llanrwst, and the Rev. Ellis Roberts, vicar of Llangwm, Corwen, have been installed honorary canons of St. Asaph Cathedral.

THE Bishop of London has sanctioned the appointment of the Rev. Dr. Cutts, vicar of Holy Trinity, Haverstock-hill; the Rev. A. J. Robinson, rector of Holy Trinity, Marylebone; and the Rev. W. Martin, rector of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, to act as hon. clerical examiners in the diocese to the Church of England Scripture Readers' Association, which employs over 140 readers in poor parishes throughout the metropolis. The Bishop of Rochester has similarly sanctioned the appointment of the Rev. G. D. Wyatt, rector of Bermondsey, for that diocese.

THE Archbishop of York has appointed the Rev. James Palmes to the Archdeaconry of the East Riding about to become vacant by the resignation of the Bishop of Hull. Mr. Palmes has recently resigned the rectory of Escrick, in the diocese of York, which he had held for twenty-three years, and has been for twelve years proctor in the Northern Convocation for the Archdeaconry of Cleveland. He graduated at University College, Durham, in 1849, and was ordained the same year to the curacy of Leeds. In 1852, he became vicar of Weeton, and in 1868, rector of Escrick.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Angel-Smith, Rev. R. W., Minor Canon of Bristol Cathedral; Vicar of Winsley-with-Limpley Stoke, Wiltshire.
Bevan, Rev. Richard Aubrey Chichester, M.A.; Vicar of Blackmore, Hants.
Colyer, Rev. J. E. C.; Curate-in-Charge of St. Anne's, Ambergate, near Matlock.
Cornish, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary, Redcliffe, and Honorary Canon of Bristol; Assistant Rural Dean of Bristol.
Deane, Rev. Henry, B.D.; Prebend or Rector of Leckford, Hants.
East, Rev. William Bernard; Vicar of St. Anne's, Newcastle.
Eckersley, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Wednesbury; Rural Dean of Walsall.
Feltoe, Rev. C. L., M.A., Head Master of the King's School, Chester; Rector of Fornham All Saints, Bury St. Edmunds.
Hale, Rev. Bernard George Richard, M.A.; Rector of Patterdale, Penrith.
Head, Rev. William, Incumbent of St. Basil's, Deritend; Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Birmingham.
Hodson, Rev. T., M.A.; Vicar of Charlton Kings, Gloucestershire.
Howard, Rev. John, B.A.; Vicar of Christ Church, Walshaw, near Bury.
Jones, Rev. Owen, Vicar of Pentrevoelas, Llanwrst; Honorary Canon of St. Asaph Cathedral.
Kirby, Rev. V. T., M.A., Curate of Shoreditch; Assistant-Master and Mathematical Lecturer, Diocesan College, Rondebosch, Cape Colony.
Lewis, Rev. Henry; Vicar of St. John's, Carisbrooke, Isle of Wight.
Leigh-Lye, Rev. Arthur, Senior Curate of Christ Church, Ramsgate; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Rugby.
Lloyd-Jones, Rev. George, Curate of Christ Church, Coseley, near Bilston; Rector of St. Mary's, Kettlebaston, near Ipswich.
Miller, Rev. A. J., M.A., Rector of Wootton; Chaplin of Hardingstone Union Workhouse.
Minshull, Rev. Thomas E., M.A.; Rector of Hughley, near Shrewsbury, and Perpetual Curate of Church Preen, Salop, by dispensation.
Morton, Rev. J. M., B.A.; Chaplain to the *Victor Emanuel* additional, for Hongkong Yard.
Padmore, Rev. Edwin Freeman, Curate; Vicar of Leckford, Hants.
Palmes, Rev. James, M.A., late Rector of Escrick; Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire.
Pigot, Rev. O. F.; Chaplain of Wandsworth Prison.
Pitt, Rev. G. L., B.A.; Rector of Foxley, Wilts.
Porter, Rev. Henry Blane, M.A., Curate; Vicar of Bridstow, Ross.
Rule, Rev. U. Z.; Vicar of Barton Stacey, Micheldever.
Sheringham, Rev. H. A., M.A.; Vicar of Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire.
Soames, Rev. W. H. K.; Minister of St George's, Westcombe Park, Blackheath.
Thomson, Rev. William Yalden, D.Theo.; Rector of Northleigh, Devonshire.
Tompson, Rev. James Richard Dutton, M.A.; Vicar of Burrington, Ludlow.
Vaughan, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of Wraxall; School Inspector for the Deanery of Portishead.
Vincent, Rev. G. H., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Pancras; Vicar of St. John's, Fulham.
Weeks, Rev. F. H. B., M.A.; Vicar of the new parish of St. Stephen's, Selly-hill, Birmingham.
White, Rev. John Benny, B.A.; Vicar of Westleigh, Devonshire.
White, Rev. William H., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Hyde; Rector of Long Newton, Darlington.
Wightman, Rev. C. E. L., M.A., Vicar of St. Alkmund's, Shrewsbury; Prebendary of Eccleshall in Lichfield Cathedral.
Wilson, Rev. W. T. H., Vicar of Widcombe; Vicar of Leyton, Essex.
Wood, Rev. F. H., M.A., Northampton; General Licence to Officiate in the Diocese of Peterborough.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barney, Rev. John, M.A., for thirty years Rector of the parish, at the Rectory, Rattlesden, on the 22nd ult., aged 79.
Bickerdike, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Shireshead, for thirty-two years Vicar of St. Mary's Leeds, at Shireshead Vicarage, near Garstang, on the 25th ult., aged 76.
Blenkin, Rev. George Beatson, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln, Rural Dean, 41 years Vicar of Boston, on the 21st ult., aged 69.
Braithwaite, Rev. Frederick, M.A., at 57 York-terrace, Regent's Park, on the 22nd ult., aged 83.
Burnett, Rev. William, M.A., late Fellow of New College, Oxford, Prebendary of Wyndham in Chichester Cathedral, and for thirty-four years Vicar of Boxgrove, at Boxgrove, Sussex on the 21st ult., aged 77.
Bussell, Rev. Frederick Vernon, Vicar of Balderton, at the Vicarage, Balderton, on the 21st ult., aged 45.
Cooke, Rev. Charles Russell, Rector, at Semer Rectory, on the 20th ult., aged 55.
Farquhar, Rev. E. M., at Bradley Court, Wotton-under-Edge, on the 21st ult., aged 55.
Milnes, Rev. Benjamin, Rector, at Stanton-on-the-Wolds, on the 25th ult., aged 80.
West, Rev. Charles Francis Luttrell, at 2, Spencer-park, Wandsworth, S.W., on the 25th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DUKE OF CLARENCE'S DEATH.

By the Very Rev. P. F. ELIOT, M.A., Dean of Windsor.

Sermon Preached in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, on Sunday, January 17th, 1892.

"And Eli said, 'It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good.'"—1 Samuel iii. 18.

THIS was the language of a God-fearing man, in old times, in the presence of a great calamity at which it was said that both the ears of every man in Israel should tingle. When Samuel told Eli every whit of the coming judgment which God had revealed to him, there was no complaint, no murmur, no cry, no despair; but a wise, calm, reverential, submissive acceptance of the will of the Lord. He said, "It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good." To-day the whole of the great Empire, of which we are members, stands under the shadow of a great and unexpected calamity—a calamity which, from the infinite pathos by which it is surrounded, cannot fail to touch and move and sadden every heart that is not as cold as stone. A young man in the very prime of life caught a chill, and, in spite of the best of medical skill and the tenderest of nurses, was in a day or two hurried within the grave. It is a pathetic story, though not an uncommon one,—the sudden cutting short of a career, the abrupt conclusion of manhood only just begun, the snatching away of the first-born from the loving embrace of a father and mother. The laying of the icy hand of death upon a young life touches our feelings and appeals to our pity. There is a sadness about such a sudden eclipse of a life of hope, which we instinctively feel for any one, whoever it may be, in the spring-time of youth who turns his face to the wall and dies. That young life which was thus so suddenly closed was not a common life; it was a life of the future heir to the throne of this realm. The destiny, which was before him in years to come, was the magnificent and most responsible one of succeeding a long line of ancestors and reigning over what is, perhaps, the most powerful empire in the world. It was a splendid career that lay before him. No earthly elevation could well be higher; no position of human magnificence could well be greater. Destined to be the sovereign of millions of subjects, the possible head of representatives, not only of the British race, but likewise of a great Oriental empire, King of England and Emperor of India, he would have stood at the very summit of earthly greatness. All these lay waiting in the distance for this young prince; and in a moment all was eclipsed. There were two or three days of hard struggling for life, and then all was over. The heir to so much greatness was suddenly snatched from the stage of life, and the greatness which was to be could never be his. The future King and Emperor now lies dead on his bed. It is very pathetic, and if anything were needed to deepen the pathos to the utmost, it is the feeling that the young prince, thus suddenly taken from us, and from the future of history, was on the eve of what, whether it be with prince or peasant, is usually the most important event of his life—his marriage. Only a week or two ago a thrill of delight and satisfaction vibrated from one end of the country to the other at the announcement of the approaching marriage of the Duke of Clarence with Princess May. Warm congratulations flowed in from every quarter; busy preparations were made in every direction to give an expression of public feeling in every town and village and family; and the announcement was greeted with the heartiest good will. Here, in this ancient Castle, with its memories of bygone ages, in this old Chapel, so bound up with the history of the English nation for well-nigh six centuries, where his father and mother were married in days gone by, and within bow shot of the very spot where he himself was born, the young prince was to have espoused, six weeks hence, the princess of his choice, amid the acclamation and prayers of the whole nation. But now the bridegroom and bride—the King and Queen of England that were to be in the future—are separated by the cruel hand of Death; the bridegroom will be followed to his grave by the tears of the Empire; and the bride—a widow before a bride—will be taken to every heart, and will find some consolation in the deep, warm affectionate sympathy of millions. What can be more pathetic than this—the sudden death of a young man in the very flower of his youth, the heir to the Throne of our great Empire, on the very eve of his nuptials? The heart must be as hard as flint that will not be touched by the story. But here, in this place, another touch is given to the pathos of the catastrophe by a death which has just taken place among ourselves. A day or two before the youthful prince lay down his life, an old member of our own collegiate body was called to his rest. Sixty years ago John Mitchell was admitted to the lay-clerkship in this college. Years before that—ever since he was six years old—he had sung as a boy in the choir of the Chapel. We all well remember his venerable figure as he took his place in the choir, and we rejoiced when, not long ago, he recovered from what seemed to be a fatal sickness. Only last Friday week he

was seen walking within the precincts. But his call came, and in the fulness of ripe age he gently sank to his rest. Yesterday they buried him close by the walls of the Chapel, which he had loved, and where, day by day, during his long life, he had sung the praises of his God. So at the same time the old lay-clerk of 82, and the young prince of 28, lay together in the arms of death. Certainly death is no respecter of persons or ages. Well, then, what are we to say? What attitude are we to assume in the presence of this great, pathetic and national calamity? We, as Christians, should not be content, like Mohammedans, to shrug our shoulders and say "*Kismet*" ("It is fate"). Neither should we simply give the rein to our feelings and shed tears of sympathy. We should all feel that the right attitude to take is that which Eli took in the ages of the past, in the presence and under the stress of the great calamity which came to him. Eli said, and we should say, too, "It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good." This language implies first the recognition of the Providence of God. "It is the Lord," said Eli; but to say that is to recognise that nothing comes to us by haphazard and nothing by inexorable fate, but that everything happens by the appointment and by the permission of the Lord. It is to recognise that God not merely made this our world, but sent it forth, subject to great unchangeable laws, and also that He interposes in human affairs so constantly and so closely, that not even so trivial an occurrence as the fall of a sparrow to the ground can take place without Him. As Christians we recognise this day the hand of the Lord in what has taken place. It was not merely an unfortunate accident; it could not have been done without Him. "Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?" It was the Lord Who called the young prince to lay down his life, as He called our aged friend to enter into his rest. The language of the text also implies submission to the will of God. Eli not only recognised that the calamity was appointed for him, but he was perfectly ready and quite willing to accept what he knew to be the will of God. He might have murmured and complained, and said bitter things against God; but there was not a whisper of complaint. He bowed his head in humble submission, and his stricken heart breathed out this fervent resignation, "It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good." Eli was a man of God under the old dispensation, but his attitude towards God under the stress of trouble was a model for every Christian to copy to-day. In our private sorrows, what can be better, and what more Christ-like, than to hush every complaint and lift up the prayer taught by the Redeemer in His hour of agony, "Father not My will, but Thine be done." In our national sorrows, such as we mourn this day as Christians, we lament the sad and pathetic calamity. As we share the grief of those upon whom it presses most sorely, we should be ready to submit to the mysterious dealing of the Most High, and to say with Eli, "It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good." Yet the language was not only a recognition of God's Providence; it was also trust in God's goodness. We believe that God is good by the revelation which has come to us by the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. If it be true, as we know it to be true, that Christ came into the world and died on the Cross to redeem sinners, then God must be good. If we know that the Son of God has come, we know it is the same with all our knowledge about God. We know that God is loving, and not tyrannical, capricious, revengeful and cruel. Death often seems in our clouded sight as if it were hardness and cruelty, but it is always love. Eli's language betrayed his trust in the goodness of God in spite of all appearances to the contrary. It looked like the cruel hand of God, if a young man in the prime of his life, with magnificent hopes and prospects before him, died; it looked like cruelty to crush the heart of the almost bride, to turn her happiness into bitterness, to take her from the very steps of the altar, to the side of the open grave, and to change her bridal wreath for mourning. It seemed cruel, but you and I are sure it was for her good. There is a darkness and mystery about it all. It is like a thick black cloud before us; but the eye of faith can pierce through the darkness and see behind it the bright shining of the Father's love. "It is the Lord," you will say; "let him do what seemeth Him good." Calamity is great, and sorrow, but you will recognise the Providence of God; you will submit to the will of God; you will put your whole trust and confidence in the goodness of God. Then let us take to our hearts in deepest and dearest sympathy our sorrowing Queen, the bereaved father and mother, the broken-hearted princess, and all the Royal Family in their grief. In one sense they are far removed from us in their exalted position, but sorrow and death are great levellers. We feel one with them this day in this our sorrow, and they, as they taste the consolation of a nation's sympathy, will feel one with us. "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin." We, then, will say ourselves, and pray that they, too, may be all ready to say likewise, as the grave closes over all that was mortal of the departed prince, "It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good."

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that the Bishop of Nottingham (Dr. Trollope) is suffering from a dangerous attack of bronchitis, at Leasingham Rectory.

THE Dean and Chapter of Rochester have elected Canon Evan Daniel, Principal of the Battersea Training College, as there representative in Convocation, in the room of the late Canon Burrows.

CONTINUITY IN SERVICE.

By the Rev. J. REID, Rector of Newtownsaville.

Sermon Preached in Newtownsaville Church, January 24th, 1892.

"Continue following the Lord your God."—1 Sam. xii. 14.

OF all the heroes of Hebrew history there is but one who excels, and there are very few who equal, Samuel the Prophet, in the lofty and sublime grandeur of his character. The only leader who surpasses him is "Moses, the man of God," whom Samuel resembled in many respects, both in character and office.

Moses, considered in all respects, is doubtless much the greatest of the whole prophetic line. With him God spoke and communed as He did with no other amongst the children of men. Next to Moses in loftiness of character, and in the high and important duties he discharged at a very critical period in the nation's history, comes the prophet Samuel.

Moses was honoured by being selected as the leader of God's people out of the bondage of Egypt, and the medium through whom God communicated to them His laws; and when his work was done, and he was called upon to retire to Mount Nebo and die in the full vigour of manhood, "God buried him":—

> This was the bravest warrior that ever buckled sword,
> This the most gifted poet that ever breathed a word;
> And never earth's philosopher traced with his golden pen
> On the deathless page, truths half so sage, as he wrote down for men.
>
> And had he not high honour, the hillside for his pall.
> To lie in state while angels wait, with stars for tapers tall,
> And the dark rock pines, like tossing plumes, over his head to wave,
> And God's own hand, in that lonely land, to lay him in the grave.

Samuel was honoured by being called to the prophetic office when yet a child. He was the first of "the goodly fellowship of the prophets," and the founder of their schools. And whether we consider his piety or his patriotism, towards his country, his unyielding firmness in reproving and contending against evil, or his generous unselfishness, except Moses alone, no grander name shines in the Hebrew annals.

"Continue following the Lord your God."

These words were spoken at a critical and supreme moment in the history of the Jewish Commonwealth. The rule of Eli had been lax and feeble, and though God's honour was dear to his heart, still his hand was too feeble, and especially in his declining years, in the discharge of the duties of Civil Magistrate. Even his own house was ruled with a slack hand, for "His sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not."

The want of resolution and firmness was the great failure in Eli's character. Good-natured, easy, and pliable, he was weak both at home and abroad. Herein is an important lesson for rulers and parents, and "all who are in authority." Men are apt to run to one extreme or the other. In some cases there is too much sternness and severity, and in others too much laxity. But as by a happy combination men may be both scientific and religious, so in matters of authority and government, it is possible to unite the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re.*

Eli's double weakness provoked the anger of the Almighty, and encouraged the enemies of Israel, and so, when Samuel was born, the nation was on the brink of ruin. The Philistines, their old enemies, had inflicted a severe defeat on them at Ebenezer (1 Sam. iv. 3), the two sons of Eli were slain, and the Ark of God taken by the Philistines.

The capture of the Ark was the crowning woe of all, and Eli, who had for forty years performed the double functions of High Priest and Judge, could bear up no longer, and sank in death under the influence of this crushing disaster. "The Ark of God is taken," said the messenger who brought news of the battle, and then the old man fell back and died.

The Ark of God is still in the field. "In the world's broad field of battle," and men wrangle and fight around it and within it. They waste their strength, and paralyse their energies, and spoil their tempers, in ecclesiastical squabbles about non-essential matters, while more than half the population of the globe is not yet Christian even in name.

The Ark of God is God's Church, and God's cause. It has enemies without, and sometimes even traitors within, while often it is but feebly and inadequately supported and defended by its professed friends. "Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself for it." If men really loved Him, they would love His Church because it *is* His.

In consequence of Eli's having dealt with a slack hand, both at home and abroad, the enemies of Israel were encouraged to attack them. And the Israelites themselves were disorganised and enfeebled, and fell into a state of vassalage under their stern and relentless foes. Samuel's efforts during the first few years of his official life were spent in endeavouring to kindle a public spirit in the nation, cast down idolatry, and restore the worship of the true God.

By the blessing of God upon his efforts idolatry was abolished, and the irruptions of their enemies checked. Hence it is said "the Children of Israel did put away Baalim and Ashtaroth, and served the Lord only," and "the Philistines were subdued and came no more into the coasts of Israel, and

the hand of the Lord was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel" (vii. 4, 13). Thus the land, which had had been kept in a state of unrest and insecurity, now had rest, and the people dwelt safely, "every man under his own vine and fig-tree." So Samuel "judged Israel all the days of his life," travelling in a circuit every year from Ramah to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and thence to Ramah where he had his residence.

In the first verse of the eighth chapter, however, we are told that "when Samuel was old, he made his sons judges over Israel." And "his sons walked not in his ways, but turned aside after lucre and took bribes and perverted judgment." A new element of disturbance now entered into the nation, through the misconduct of its governors.

This act of Samuel in regard to his sons is the only point where any flaw is traceable in his character so far as it is related in the Bible. There is just room for suspicion that in the management and discipline of his family he copied the example of Eli too closely; but nothing definite is said on the subject, and we need not decide where the Bible has not decided. This much is plain, however, that his sons were unworthy both of their parentage and their office.

One result of their misconduct was the change of the government of Israel, "from a Divinely ruled Republic to a regularly constituted Monarchy." At least their misrule contributed largely to bring about this change. The government of judges had lasted 450 years. Of these Samuel was the *last*, as of prophets he was the *first*.

It has been said that one reason (perhaps the chief one) why the late Emperor of Brazil was dethroned by his own subjects, was because he was a man of peaceful pursuits and tastes, fond of literature, science and art, and the society of learned men. Hence his government was too tame for his people. There was not enough of the Napoleonic spirit about him, not enough glitter and show, and martial array and warrior spirit, as if the chief end of a king was to assume a fighting attitude, and challenge everybody to mortal combat. The man, be he sovereign or subject, who labours in such peaceful pursuits as tend to develop the intelligence and material resources of a country, is a far greater benefactor of the race than all the despots who have ever cursed the world with their combativeness. But people sometimes, in their mad frenzy and folly, drive away their best advisers, or commit the blunder of selling their friends and buying their enemies.

The clamour for a king showed deep ingratitude to Samuel, after all he had done for them, and all the evils he had saved them from. But

> Memory soon, of service done, deserteth the ingrate.

They had a pretext, it is true, in the bad conduct of Samuel's sons, and of this they failed not to take advantage. But Samuel had not himself abdicated the office of Judge, though his sons were associated with him as helpers.

There was also in their demand a spirit of rebellion against the order of governors God Himself had set over them, and a spirit of inordinate ambition and pride in desiring to be like the rest of the nations round about them.

Samuel was no warrior, going forth in armour to "lay fenced cities in ruinous heaps," or lead forlorn hopes, or kill and capture hosts of enemies. But, though not a professional soldier, there lurked under the peaceful mantle of the Prophet, a heart and spirit courageous as any, and brave as the bravest.

The people's demand for a king displeased Samuel, and no wonder; but his refuge was near—"he prayed to the Lord" (viii. 4). This is always best. "When troubles assail and dangers affright," go and tell Jesus; there you are sure to find sympathy, and He will teach you what to do.

> Earthly friends may fail or leave us,
> One day soothe, the next day grieve us;
> But this friend will ne'er deceive us,
> Oh, how He loves!

As soon as Samuel learned God's will about the people's demand, he hastened to comply with it, and hushed every murmur on his own part.

God expressed His will thus, "Hearken unto their voice, and make them a king." So the king is selected, anointed and initiated by the prophet into the duties of his high office, without a frown of envy or a pang of jealousy. And as Samuel steps down from the pinnacle of power he has so long and so worthily occupied, and introduces the newly-made Sovereign to the nation, he is the first to welcome the new Governor with the loyal exclamation, "God save the King!"

Having equipped the vessel of the State, and arranged and settled the new form of government, he assembled all the people at Gilgal, that he might give them some counsels, cautions, and warnings as to the future.

He reminds them of his own past career amongst them from his childhood. That his life had been as an open book, "known and read of all men." He demands that they shall now speak out, and bear witness as to whether he had defrauded them, or oppressed them, or received bribes to pervert justice, and they all answer, with one accord, "Thou hast not defrauded us, nor oppressed us, neither hast thou taken aught of any man's hand."

This was a glorious testimony to the justice, integrity and humanity of the prophet's rule.

Happy the ruler, by whatever name he may be called, King, Emperor, or President, about whom such testimony can be borne, and happy the people if they only knew it, who are blest with such rulers. We as a nation have been singularly favoured of Heaven in this respect, in the mild and beneficent rule of a sovereign revered not only by the subjects

of her own vast empire, but by the whole civilized world. This accounts for the vast wave or tide of respectful sympathy and condolence that has lately flowed to the royal homes of England from all parts of the world, in consequence of the dark shadow that has so suddenly and unexpectedly fallen upon them in the mysterious Providence of God.

There has been something so inexpressibly touching and sad about the death of the Prince, that the feelings of people, not only in the British Islands or the British Empire but all over the world, have been deeply moved. But "God hath His mysteries of grace, ways that we cannot tell." Had it pleased God to prolong his days he would one day have worn the crown of the greatest empire the world has ever seen. Let us hope that he has gone from the prospect of a corruptible crown to the enjoyment of an incorruptible one, and let us also pray that the Queen, always so tender and sympathetic, and ready to feel for others' sorrows, and the royal parents of the Prince, may be sustained and comforted under this crushing blow, by the Almighty as He alone can.

Samuel after recounting some of the mighty acts God had done for Israel in the past, in delivering them from their enemies exhorts them to fear and obey and serve the Lord, and continue to follow Him, and then blessing and prosperity and happiness would attend them. But, on the other hand, he declared, "If ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king."

This was plain speaking to both king and people in the presence of each other. And then the aged prophet lifts his hands to heaven and calls upon God to confirm his warning by sending thunder and rain at a time of the year when such phenomena are never seen or heard in Palestine. King and people had now entered on a new career under the most favourable auspices, and what they needed most was the spirit of *continuity*—"Continue following the Lord your God." That is a beautiful prayer, in which we desire that all our works may be "begun, continued, and ended" in God, that thus living, and walking, and working, we may glorify His holy name, and finally by His mercy obtain everlasting life.

It is not enough—though it is something—to *begin* well. We must continue and advance, and "not be wearied in well-doing." Sometimes a year or a day is well begun, and people resolve to "amend their lives," and determine to turn over a new page in life's book.

Like the Galatians, they "run well" for a while. But after a short time all their resolutions and purposes of amendment are forgotten or broken, and they go down before the first blast of temptation. So the lives of many are a long series of good beginnings nipped in the bud, and bringing no fruit to perfection.

Now God's grace is still sufficient, and the weapons of the Christian armour are as effective as ever, both for offensive and defensive purposes.

The cause of the failure is that we do not sufficiently rely on the one, or handle the other with sufficient energy and vigour.

Continuity, or perseverance in human affairs is one great secret of success. Most people have heard or read the story of King Robert Bruce and the Spider. The little persevering creature, after six failures, succeeded in fastening its thread to the beam in the seventh attempt. So Bruce had as often attempted to free his native country from the English yoke, and failed. Not knowing well what to do, he resolved to be guided by the spider. If it failed he would go to the wars in Palestine and never see his native land again. If it succeeded he would "try again," which he did. And as he had never before gained a victory, so he never after suffered any severe defeat.

Whether this incident be really true or not, and I see nothing improbable in it, the moral is the same—continue, persevere, advance. Let the motto of the German soldier be yours, *Immer vowärts* (ever forward). The influence of birth, fortune, and patronage sinks into insignificance, compared with enthusiasm, diligence, and perseverance.

A great soldier (or Admiral rather), Lord Nelson, said he gained all his victories by always being a quarter of an hour in advance of the enemy. So let it be in our spiritual warfare.

Harassed by temptation men will undoubtedly be. Inducements to evil there will be in plenty. The devil, the father of evil, will ply all his arts to succeed in our overthrow. Let us always be ready and prepared for him. Well armed and on the watch, and so, when the assault is made, the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation will protect both our hearts and our heads, and with the feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, and vigorously wielding the sword of the Spirit, and adding another weapon called all-prayer, the enemy will be put to flight.

"For some days past," said an eminent servant of God, "I have been unusually harassed by temptations of various kinds, and am often led to inquire, 'Why am I thus?'" So it is still: the Christian soldier is not only drilled and equipped, he is also placed in the field, and his qualities tried. Shall they turn their backs on the enemy, or meanly and cowardly surrender on demand; and that, too, under the eye and leadership of the Great Captain of their salvation? No, never, never, never, Christian!

> Will ye flee in danger's hour?
> Know ye not your Captain's power?

If the presence of a Napoleon or a Wellington was counted equal to many thousands of common men, to how many is our great Leader and Commander equal? or rather, to what is He not equal?

"Is anything too hard for the Lord" in nature or in grace?

> Onward, then, to battle move,
> More than conquerors ye shall prove,
> Though opposed by many a foe,
> Christian soldiers, onward go.

"Continue following the Lord your God." The better to induce and encourage you to do so, remember these six things:—

1. You have a Leader who never lost a battle.

2. You have the most righteous and glorious cause in the world.

3. You have a suit of armour that, if rightly put on and worn, is impenetrable.

4. You have every assistance, help, and guidance you need as to the service required from you.

5. You have a reliable assurance of victory if you will only be strong and very courageous, and continue or persevere.

6. You will have at the end the victor's crown of glory in the mansions of the Father's house above.

But, on the other hand, the consequences of disloyalty, and disobedience, and apostasy are almost too fearful to contemplate.

The newly established monarchy of Israel entered on what might have been a victorious and prosperous career; and, blessed by the counsels and prayers of Samuel, all went tolerably well for a time. But soon appeared the necessity there was for the prophet's solemn warning. Their old enemies the Philistines collected a vast army, and again attacked them so vigorously that the Israelites were in a great strait, and they "hid themselves in caves, and in thickets, and in rocks, and in high places, and in pits" (xiii. 6.) Saul was now in the utmost perplexity. Samuel had directed him to wait for seven days, and then, said the Prophet, "I will come to thee and show thee what thou shalt do" (x. 8.) Seven days passed, and Samuel came not. His enemies grew bolder, and threatened his utter ruin, and his own army melted away. Why does the prophet tarry? To Saul, no doubt, the delay seemed madness, as throwing away all chance of victory, or even escape. So he rashly took upon him functions that did not belong to him, and offered "burnt-offering" (xiii. 9, 12.) Just as he is done Samuel comes, and the king goes out to meet him and seek his blessing. Samuel reproves him for his disobedience, assuring him that he had "done foolishly," and that in consequence the kingdom would not be confirmed in his family. To Saul, no doubt, the prophet's conduct seemed foolish, if not unreasonable, and his own wise, and longer delay ruinous; "My thoughts are not as your thoughts, neither are My ways your ways, saith the Lord."

"To obey," as Samuel reminded him on the occasion of a future transgression, "is better than sacrifice." Man's duty is simply to do as God tells him, neither adding to nor diminishing the Divine rule. But, in our ignorance and blindness, and presumption, we are for superseding or improving God's plan. And instead of doing just what and as we are told, we set about doing something else as a substitute for it which we consider as good, or perhaps better. Saul's sin was the old sin of the human family, *disobedience*. It is the great sin of every age. His duty was to *wait* till Samuel came, but he did not. And though what he did was an act of religion, God would not accept even that in violation of a plain command.

The service God not unfrequently asks of His people still, is not only to labour, but to wait.

He does not so often say, "Do this mighty work for Me," as He says, "Be patient for My sake."

It is not the high enterprise He desires, so much as the quiet continuance in well-doing.

Many of us would rather choose to climb the mountain side than plod along, steadily and wearily, miles of level road. Many would be willing, no doubt, to serve Him if they only might do it in their own way. But the thing God requires most of us all is to have no will but His.

But men despise His yoke for being easy, and His burden for being light. They think it such a poor service He requires from them that, like Naaman, they turn and go away in a rage.

Let us trust to Divine wisdom to guide us, and Divine power for protection while we continue to follow and obey the Lord our God, and especially let us set and keep before us the example of the Saviour Himself in His *obedience*, *humility*, *patience*, inflexible adherence to virtue and duty, prayerfulness, and heavenly-mindedness or unworldliness. "Set your affections on things above," and "press toward the mark for the prize of your high calling of God in Christ Jesus." God will accept no substitute from any man, king, or beggar, for unquestioning obedience. "Only fear the Lord and serve Him in truth, for consider how great things He hath done for you." So shall you obey the precept of the Saviour, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me." This is but an expansion by the Saviour of the warning advice of Samuel. Therefore I say to all, and to the young especially, if you would be successful in life, happy in death, and joyful to all eternity, then work into your lives this advice of the great Aristides of the Hebrew Commonwealth, and "continue following the Lord your God."

The Lord Chancellor has appointed the Rev. J. G. Tetley, M.A., vicar of Highnam, Gloucestershire, Canon Residentiary of Bristol Cathedral, in succession to the late Archdeacon Norris. Canon Tetley had been offered and had accepted All Saints' Clifton; but he will now remain at Highnam. He graduated at Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1864, and was ordained three years later to the curacy of Caldicot, Monmouthshire; he afterwards served curacies at Badminton and Henley-on-Thames, and was appointed vicar of Highnam in 1876, and Rural Dean of North Forest in 1888.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1892.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND YEAR-BOOK.

IT is recorded of an old-fashioned country rector, now deceased, that, over-worried by the number of returns of every kind his ordinary was for ever demanding, he replied to the question, "Do you find any special hindrance in the supervision of your parish?" "Yes, the Bishop." A little sympathy is no doubt due to the good easy-going gentlemen who are everlastingly plagued to undertake the duty of census enumerators and the like, and we cannot say the task is always made agreeable, and the results received with courtesy, not to say gratitude. Still we must congratulate ourselves upon the fruits displayed in the just issued "Official Year-Book."

It is difficult to understand how the "Liberationists" could meet the statements and inferences the Year-Book supplies. The figment of a State-supported Church melts away before the figures which put the Church income from all sources of endowment at some £5½ millions—by no means exclusively tithes be it noticed. The "Liberationist" generally puts it at from 7 to 10 millions derived entirely from tithes and taxes. During the last two centuries the private endowments have increased by ¼ of a million, but the services of the Church have increased almost by infinity, there is simply no comparison between the efficiency of the Church in 1703 and 1892. We question whether any human being but a "Liberationist" could find fault with the only institution of any kind established by the State which goes on increasing its efficiency without increasing its demands, and has continued to do so for centuries.

This brings us to the second great fact established by the Year-Book. The Church of England is the most thriving, the most active, and the best supported Church in the world. We know the usual criticisms of the clergy and the Church: "dumb dogs that cannot bark," "blind leaders," "bigoted and ignorant priests," "out of touch with the people, and snoring tranquilly over smouldering fires"—this sort of abuse is frequently uttered even by earnest people who ought to know better. Now compare it with facts. The Year-Book deals only with partial returns. Six whole dioceses are not included, and of those that are, 10 per cent. of the clergy have made no returns (as we noticed before, the labour is great, the task is not always agreeable, and when successfully accomplished, wins no praise, and little thanks). And yet we find that the revenue voluntarily contributed, through parochial organisations alone, amounts to more than 3½ millions, or making allowance for the diocese and clergy not enumerated, fully equals the revenue from endowments. Add to this the gifts of individuals, the results of offertories and collections for parish purposes, and it is plain that as direct revenue the Church provides by its organisations far more than it receives from all its endowments put together, tithes included. But to raise direct revenue is only a small part of the Church's work. Vast sums are raised annually for charities, millions are contributed to home and foreign missions, enormous expenditure is met for purposes of education, and this in the mother-country alone, leaving out of account the Colonies. Was ever so brilliant a record of yearly work? We say emphatically that for efficient service, active enthusiasm, and generous liberality, the Church of England is second to none in the world. We challenge the whole body of Nonconformists to produce like results, and yet we are told that the Church of England is not a national Church. It only remains to add that this splendid result of voluntary effort is not in spite of the Church's connection with the State. For it is a curious thing that while some are hostile to the Church, because they pretend she is dead, others are angry because she is so much alive. It is true that the Church could dispense to-morrow with her endowments and be financially none the worse. But the world would. The prestige of establishment, so highly valued and so sorely envied, would no longer atone for hard work and poor pay, men could no longer be got by hundreds to labour for less than the wages of a skilled artizan. The amount of endowment withdrawn would have to be replaced by larger sums to meet increased salaries, and the money would be got without difficulty, but directly at the cost of the nation; the funds withdrawn from charities and from education would be replaced by rates, and the burden of rates would more than balance the relief of tithes. It is marvellous that the "Liberationists" should be so blind to the things

that belong to their profit as well as their peace. It is in their own interests, not in the interests of the clergy, who, we are convinced, would be pecuniarily better off for disestablishment, that we warn them of the error of their ways.

WILLIAM REEVES, LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

THE "PRAYER BOOK" CHURCHMAN.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, D.D., RECTOR OF WARRENPOINT, AUTHOR OF "THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK," "IRELAND SINCE THE REFORMATION," "IRELAND SINCE THE UNION," ETC.

(*Continued from page* 117.)

V.

ONE of the last public occasions on which he appeared in the United Diocese was the funeral of the late Dr. King of Newry, Archdeacon of Dromore, to whom he was sincerely attached. When the clergy returned to the church to unrobe, there was a general rush to clear the vestry before the Bishop came in. One of the clergy, with surplice, stole, and hood, bundled with bag and umbrella in a confused pile under his arm, met him full tilt in the narrow passage and drew aside to let him pass. "Never turn up the point of an umbrella," said his lordship, eyeing the bundle with a half-amused scrutiny, "you might easily knock out my eye." It was a tempting opportunity, and the offender replied, "My lord, you have just lost one *oculus episcopi*, it would be a bad look out if you lost the other too (two)." For one moment there was a keen lighting up of the eye, a sharp twitching of the muscles about the mouth, the temptation to retort and crush the punster was evidently a severe strain, then the gleam died out, and with a stifled "Yes, so it would," he passed on. It was a more eloquent tribute to his dead friend than if he had preached for an hour.

There was a deep undertone of pathos in the closing words of his last address to the Synod at Belfast in October, 1891, when he expressed the hope that "the little breezes" that ruffled the surface in some few parishes would soon subside, and all parties settles down to work together for the cause of their common Master." Very soon indeed as far as he was concerned the breezes were over, and the haven reached. He was too much interested for God's glory and for the welfare of His Church, and too deeply solicitous for the well-being of the diocese not to feel pained by those "little breezes," though neither breeze nor storm could make him swerve from what he believed to be the pathway of duty. Popular in the general sense of the word with the laity he could not possibly be, for he was too unselfish and too loyal to his clergy ever to win the applause of the multitude; but thoughtful religious laymen doubtless cannot but feel that there was something better than popularity hunting, something higher than the spirit that courts the favour of men, something most truly chivalrous in the manner in which he diverted on himself odium or unpopularity. It seems to me impossible not to admire the spirit of one who, whenever any change was about to be made in a parish which was in any respect likely to create friction between the parson and his people, to provoke adverse criticism, or to excite popular prejudices was wont to say to the rector, "If any objection be made, put all the blame on me, I'll bear all the responsibility, and you may say I gave directions to have it so. It was not strange that when he died there was but one feeling amongst the clergy "that a Prince and a great man had fallen in Israel." To serve under such a leader was in itself a distinction.

Speaking at a recent meeting in Belfast, the Dean of Connor, Dr. Murray, said:—"He was brought nto very constant contact with the late bishop from the commencement of his episcopate, and he would say this for him that he was the busiest man with whom he had ever been associated in the whole course of his life. The first years were clouded by depression of spirit. In such trying circumstances the deceased bishop had conducted his correspondence with perhaps greater accuracy and greater attention than even in the latter years of his life. He had known him to have all his letters written before his breakfast, and those letters were by no means few in number, and were by no means—many of them—easy to answer. He could say this further for the late bishop, that while he had thoughts about the Book of Armagh, and very serious and constant thoughts, yet the thoughts uppermost in his mind, the thoughts which were the most constant and often the most painful, were the affairs of the united diocese."

His diocesan charges and annual addresses at the synod were practical and pointed, and though it was evident from the very first that the work of such a diocese was beyond his strength, yet it was also clear that the Bishop meant to do all that in him lay to meet the strain and to fulfil the duties of his office. As a bishop he was devotedly loyal to his clergy, and never hesitated to identify himself with, and to defend the action of any man who became unpopular, as long as the unpopularity originated in what he considered the discharge of duty. Those who broke the law of God or of the Church he may have pitied, but he did not spare the rod, nor when he deemed it necessary the pruning-knife. As a rule he did not seem to care for churches floridly decorated; and it seems like the irony of fate that his last official ceremony in the diocese should be the consecration of the Chapel of the Resurrection in Belfast Castle, on December 30th, 1891. On Dec. 26th he was married in Dublin, by special licence, to Miss Charlotte Townley, of Ballingarry, and on January 12th, 1892, he died, or rather entered into his rest. The following, which I extract from the report of sermons, preached in connection with his funeral, as given the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, cannot but prove interesting:

The Very Rev. John Walton Murray, LL.D., Dean of Connor, preaching at Ballymena, expressed himself as follows:—"I might speak of the scrupulous care he manifested in all matters connected with his ordinations, which he held regularly at the four appointed seasons in each year. He was not a man to put on an extra appearance of sanctity, but I know he made the candidates the subject of his prayers; and, notwithstanding the number that from year to year passed through his hands, he never forgot the impression made upon him by each candidate at the time of his examination. . . . There was something very touching, and at the same time very striking, in the circumstances immediately preceding his death. On the last night his mind wandered somewhat, if that can be called wandering which was in the course of

his daily life. He repeated passages from sermons he had lately preached—from one sermon in particular, delivered at a confirmation held immediately before his last ordination. Then his thoughts went out to that Royal Irish Academy in which he took so deep an interest, but they soon came back to their former channel, and he repeated the Creed and the Benediction, closing all with words borne in from the late Christmas-tide—'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men.'"

At Newtownards, Canon Porter described the loss to the diocese in the following words—"A Prince has fallen in the Israel of God." At Glencraig, Canon Duke, among other things, spoke of the deceased prelate in reference to opening addresses at meetings, his mode of conducting confirmation, and his kindness in taking the duty of sick clergymen who were unable to perform their duties—"However interesting or important might be the subject or object of the meeting, it was rendered tenfold more so by the amount of information which his careful research brought to bear upon it, expressed in pure and simple Saxon, with lucid, calm, and convincing logic. How thoughtfully and impressively he administered the holy rite of confirmation must have struck those who had the privilege of being present. He might, without reproach, have lightened the labour of confirming a large number by adopting the practice of some bishops, of saying the words to a whole railful at a time, and then laying a hand on each of two candidates together. But such relief from bodily fatigue he allowed himself not, but, laying both hands on one young person, he repeated the whole of the confirming prayer for each. . . . . Not a few of his clergy can speak with gratitude for the kind way in which Bishop Reeves would walk in and relieve a sick or enfeebled brother by taking the whole or a part of the service on a Sunday."

The Rev. H. D. Murphy, D.D., speaking at St. George's said—"It is to be feared that the only quality some look for in a bishop is popular preaching; but the main business of a bishop is not to preach, but to ordain, to confirm, to organise, to rule over his diocese, and to guide it with good and wholesome counsel and instruction. Such a one was the deceased prelate. As a bishop he was one to whom all his clergy could look up as a 'Father in God.' We could always rely on him to do the right, not the expedient; the just, not the popular. He never spoke 'to split the ears of the groundlings,' never pandered to vulgar prejudices, never sold the cause of God for popularity. He was a man of unbending will, yet genial, courteous, and kind withal. He was simple in his manner of life, humble in his own estimation, yet when he had given a decision in any case you might depend that no violent clamour, no ignorant indignation, would make him say 'Yes' when once he had said No.'"

The Rev. R. C. Oulton, at Glynn, speaking of the late Bishop's churchmanship, said:—"He was, moreover, a thoroughly loyal Churchman, and many will remember his unswerving votes in defence of the Prayer Book, in conjunction with others, during the revision controversy in the General Synod of the Church of Ireland. If he should be thought by some not to have altogether moved with the times, so far as the surroundings of religion were concerned, he was at least thoroughly sound as to Church doctrine, avoiding extremes. All earnest Churchmen looked to him for support, and felt that they were looking to one who would not disappoint or betray them."

In 1891 he was elected president of the Royal Academy, and his address on that occasion was full of interest. It was spoken before his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, and abounded with references to the work done by the Academy, and all the successes achieved by Irish literary men. "His tribute," says a Dublin journal "to Irish scholars was cordial and appreciative, and his conception of the breadth of learning, and the fraternity of studies was apparent in the entire absence of any creed influence in his testimony." But this breadth of mind and toleration of religious difference may be inferred still more strikingly from the letter he wrote to Dr. Palmer of Armagh, on hearing of the death of the Roman Catholic Primate, Dr. McGettigan. Dr. Palmer had written to the Bishop of Down, informing him of the death of the Primate, and the following is an extract from the letter received in reply, and which was dated December 4th, 1887:—

"My Dear Palmer—I thank you for your letter of yesterday. I was prepared for the news of our dear old friend's death, as the papers implied that he was near his end. I loved the old man, partly for his amiable disposition, so tender and benevolent, and partly for his invariable friendship and kindness to myself. The day I left Armagh to enter on my new duties he called and paid me a farewell visit, and he shed tears when we were parting. He and I were born the same year, and I was a few months his senior. What a noble figure and presence he had! and his heart was equal to his frame. By his death, you and I lose a very good and estimable friend."

Such was William Reeves, Lord Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore. He sat in the seat once filled by Jeremy Taylor, and though he had not the eloquence of "the English Chrysostom," yet we think future ages will say that he was not unworthy to rank even in comparison with his illustrious predecessor, for he was, in the judgment of all men, every inch a bishop.

"And to add greater honours to his age
Than man could give him, he died fearing God."

In closing these imperfect observations which neither zeal nor affection could render worthy of the subject, I desire to thank most gratefully all who have assisted me, either with information or sympathy; one name of those whose approval I value I cannot but mention — the honoured friend of Dr. Reeves — the wisest adviser, the most steadfast and truest friend my own ministry has ever known—the Very Rev. Thomas Le Ban Kennedy, D.D., Dean of Clogher.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

THE PURPOSE OF GOD CANNOT BE FRUSTRATED.

Sir,—I wish to bring forward some of the most important among the revealed purposes of God.

"Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me. The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption

into the glorious liberty of the children of God. As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. Put all things under Him, that God may be all in all. The living God is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe. Gather together all things in Christ. Having made peace through the blood of His Cross by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself."

It seems to me that very few Christians, except those who lived in the earliest centuries, have believed that the great, all-comprehensive purpose of God, as indicated in the foregoing texts, will be fulfilled. I have often been met by the statement that, although it is God's purpose to save all men, those who will not come to Him will be lost for ever. I venture to submit my reasons for a contrary opinion. I hold that the fact of any (however great the number) not coming to God in this life will delay, but cannot frustrate the Divine purpose. All men by nature are morally unable to come to God. Our Saviour said, "No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him." He came, not only that forgiveness might be extended to sinners, but that means might be furnished to cure our mental and moral defects, among which a perverse will is one of the most fatal. I do not believe a single human being has ever come to God by the force of natural ability; and in that respect I agree with the rigorous declarations of Calvin. He said in his "Institutes," Book III.: "The will is converted from an evil into a good one entirely by God. We are not sufficient even to think. Whatever is good in the human will is the work of grace." One Calvinist, Toplady, who wrote the hymn "Rock of Ages," asserted in a work of his I have seen, that the scheme of redemption would have been a total failure if the principle of election had not been introduced. That principle implies irresistible moral constraint being exercised on individuals, so as to implant and sustain conviction of sin, repentance, faith, hope and love, and thus ensure final perseverance. I believe such ideas to be in harmony with the declarations of Scripture, but that they exhibit only a meagre and narrow portion of the glorious truths revealed. Election is applied, not only for the benefit of the elect, but as a beautiful and appropriate measure to ensure the welfare of all. When I read the Bible, in my early manhood, during many years, while removed from opportunities of hearing religious teachers, I became gradually impressed by the concurrence of its several parts to instil and implant the conviction that it is the firm purpose of God to vanquish all evil through the superior energy of moral good. I also perceived clear indications that spiritual capabilities and privileges have been and are conferred on some for the good of the whole, and not merely to promote the welfare of those termed the elect. If we apply our reasoning faculties and consult our moral consciousness while reading the declarations of Scripture, we may, I think, derive a strong belief that those who are in this life united by faith to Christ must necessarily and inevitably strive earnestly for the spiritual welfare of others, not only on earth, but beyond the grave. To my mind, the grand principle is conspicuous that moral transformation is to be effected wherever sin has entered throughout the illimitable extent of intelligent life by the instrumentality of created agencies under the inspiring, animating, sustaining, directing, controlling influences of the Holy Spirit. The Word of God is the Sword of the Spirit, and is to be constantly employed in this mighty warfare. The ceaseless conflict between sin and holiness, love, and malignity will continue, until every mind and heart lovingly owns the sway of the Redeemer. The most ignorant, brutalised, callous and cruel-hearted will gradually perceive and feel the evil of sin, the beauties of holiness, and the wondrous love of the Saviour. Such purposes could not be accomplished without making all intelligent beings acquainted with the nature and properties of moral evil, and the fearful consequences it entails in the brief life on earth, and in that beyond the tomb. I have always been solemnly impressed by the striking and awful terms employed by the Saviour in regard to the penalties inflicted on sinners in a future life. But the language employed does not justify the assertion that the penalties, whether "few stripes or many stripes," will be endless. I am not able to imagine the effect on the spirit at death of being liberated from the influence of the corporeal organs.

One of your correspondents in the PULPIT of to-day, who unjustly accused me of making assertions on my own authority, now says: I cannot proceed without help from others. I am fully aware of my own imperfect knowledge, and naturally refer to the opinions of eminent men, who appear qualified to judge. The argument against endless sin and misery from the moral consciousness of Christians seems to me to have irresistible force. All true Christians feel compassion for those who suffer; all true Christians are earnestly desirous that the Saviour may reign over every human mind and heart. I do not see how any intelligent person can suppose that such sentiments will be extinguished in a future life, or that the efforts against sin and misery will cease. When it is said, "He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet," I understand the meaning to be energetic measures of conflict in order to convert enemies into friends by effecting their deliverance from sin, so that God may be all in all. When it is said, "We shall reign with Him," I also call to mind the passages, "Workers together with God," and "whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant;" and I rejoice in the belief that the redeemed will participate actively in those conflicts against evil. To reign in the Gospel sense is to exercise moral power for good, not to exhibit splendour and show. I find inexpressible consolation and delight in such views concerning the future life, while the general conceptions of heaven appear to me "stale, flat, and unprofitable," even impossible; certainly most dreary.

Canonbury, J. B.
March 5th, 1892.

FAITH AS A FACULTY.

SIR,—I must thank your two correspondents, Mr. Hobson and Mr. Lawrence for their letters. They are written in the right spirit and should not fail to call out exactly what we need, the truth. I can only claim to be a humble seeker after that.

I have been thinking out this subject for a long time, and I have come to the conclusion that faith is the name—at any rate it may be—of a distinct faculty. I showed clearly enough, as I think, that the word has other meanings. I was glad, when in Switzerland last year, to hear the good pastor of the place call it *un nouveau sens*. Neither of your correspondents has contributed anything in the least likely to alter my

opinion. I hope they do not mind my saying this, as I shall now, though briefly, give my reasons.

Fear, love, and hope are not faculties. These words describe states of being. A lunatic, believing himself a king, is not exercising faith. This is self-evident.

No one, if he knows it, believes a lie. We call that faith which apprehends revealed truth. The faculty which does this is very different from that which distinguishes between the statements made by our fellow-creatures. We must have an instance of the faith "to which God appeals in the Gospels," before we can predicate of it that it is a faculty common to all.

I must take exception to Mr. Hobson's rendering of Eph. ii. 8; τοῦτο is not in agreement with ἡ πίστις, 'tis true; but it is in agreement with τὸ δῶρον, and this brings it to the same thing. ἡ πίστις, which is τὸ δῶρον, is of God. The point, too, is emphasised by the expression a little lower down "αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα." I had not this, however, or any other passage in particular, in my mind.

If I might put Mr. Hobson's position right I should rather say it stands thus: That salvation comes of physical action is nonsense, but that it comes of the faculty of πίστις is sound sense. This squares with the Apostle's thought; the other does not.

How can a man justify his not having any gift when he is told that it is his for the asking?

I had once the honour of half-an-hour's conversation with the great Dr. Charcot. He illustrated a point by referring to Pascal's treatment of a man who wanted salvation. The dialogue was briefly this. The Man: "Can you tell me how to be saved?" Pascal: "Believe on the Lord Jesus." The Man: "I can't believe; can you tell me how I can have faith?" Pascal: "Yes, submit your will to God's will and you will have faith." But all this is only working in a circle.

Art. XII. makes faith the root and principle of all good works; ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε, the Saviour often said. This word πίστις, as the context always shows, was the name of an active principle. I name this a faculty. Mr. Hobson has something more to do yet before he convinces me that it is not.

This view of matters does not justify unbelief. It simply shows that as "it is impossible without faith to please God," we should be exceedingly earnest in seeking this most excellent of all gifts.

I am glad to read all that Mr. Lawrence says, the *contra* as well as the *pro*. True, the actions of a faculty enable us to know of its existence. I work, therefore I exist. The *ego* is here put for the whole. But I am made up of many parts. In these parts are lodged many faculties; the eye for instance. I should not know that I could not see if I had never had an eye. But the fact that I can see assures me that I have an eye. By faith I know the things of God. Inasmuch as I know these things, I know that I have the faculty. It would appear that by the same process of reasoning I prove the opposite of Mr. Lawrence. Which is right?

I have nothing to object to Mr. Lawrence's concluding paragraph. But the fear is that while men are reasoning about the canons of the Bible (higher criticism) they are imperilling their soul's salvation by neglecting the great truths inside.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, March 5th, 1892.

CARDINAL NEWMAN AN ALLEGED PLAGIARIST.

SIR, — Your learned correspondent "C. P. M." seems to be unaware of the fact that Sancta Clara "On the Articles of the Anglican Church" was a well-known book at the time of the publication of Tract 90, and no one ventured to call Newman to account as a plagiarist. The work is referred to at large by Mr. Oakley in his pamphlet on Tract 90, where he shows that Bishop Montague in 1624 was made the subject of charges similar to those levelled against Newman, but was acquitted on the judgment of several of the bishops, including Laud and Andrewes. No doubt your correspondent is aware that there are other treatises besides that of Sancta Clara, from which Newman might as justly have been charged with plagiarising, as for example Cassander's *Via ad Pacem Ecclesiasticam*, and Du Pin's *Commonitorium*. I suppose that at the time of the publication of Tract 90, there was not a writing touching on the controversy better known than that of Sancta Clara, and no one therefore could have thought of Newman in this connection as a plagiarist.

By the way, the real name of Francis a Sancta Clara was Christopher Davenport and not "Davenant." These remarks are made quite irrespective of the merits or demerits of Newman's way of dealing with the Thirty-nine Articles.

J. A. C.

P.S.—I am not aware of the grounds on which it is stated that Davenport, who was a Dominican friar and private Chaplain to Queen Henrietta, was a "pervert."

THE Bishop of Marlborough, presiding at the third monthly meeting of the Funeral Reform Association at the Church House, Westminster, last week, moved that the "time had come when an effort should be made to carry into practical effect the principles advocated by the Society." This resolution was carried unanimously. The Rev. W. Hocking moved, and the Rev. S. J. Stone seconded a resolution in favour of a petition to Convocation asking for alternative burial services, which was carried unanimously, as was also a resolution to petition Parliament for improved burial laws. It was stated that Lord Salisbury had replied to the memorial of the Association that attention to burial legislation was impossible this Session.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Archer, Rev. Cecil, B.A., Chaplain to the *Superb*.

Atkinson, Rev. Hepworth F., M.A., Vicar of Royston, near Barnsley; Vicar of Darrington, near Pontefract. Patron, the Archbishop of York.

Barnacle, Rev. Henry Edwin; Rector of Grafton Regis, Northants. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Bellhouse, Rev. Herbert L., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Andrew's, Ashton-on-Ribble, Preston; Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Clitheroe.

Bromley, Rev. Cecil, M.A., Rector of Coates, near Whittlesea; Incumbent of St. Anne's, Hindsford, Tyldesley.

Chaplin, Rev. William, Curate of All Saints', Margaret-street; Chaplain of Ely Theological College.

Chute, Rev. T. D., M.A., Rector of Moulton; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of Depwade. Patron, the Bishop of Norwich.

Collett, Rev. G., Vicar of St. Mark's, Peckham; Vicar of Basildon, Berks. Patrons, the Simeon Trustees.

David, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Vicar of Llanddewi-Velfrey, Pembrokeshire; Rector of Crinow, Pembrokeshire, by dispensation. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

De Moleyns, Rev. Alured B., M.A.; Vicar of Kewstoke, Somerset. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Dewe, Rev. Robert, M.A., Curate of the Parish Church, Beccles, Suffolk; Rector of Geldeston, Norfolk. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Drury, Rev. Thomas W., M.A., Principal of the Church Missionary College, Islington; Assistant Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Liverpool.

Dwyer, Rev. Philip, M.A.; Rector of Thwaite St. Mary, Norfolk. Patrons, the Rev. Ernest John Heriz Smith, of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and Mr. Edward Cadge, of Loddon, Norfolk.

Evans, Rev. John; Vicar of Glyndyfrdwy, Llangollen. Patron, the Bishop of St. Asaph.

Evans, Rev. John Owen, B.A., late Curate of St. John's, Cwmbach, Llechrhyd; Perpetual Curate of Tretower, Brecon. Patron, the Rev. Augustus Browne, of Trebinshun, Bwlch.

Farmer, Rev. James; Vicar of Balderton, Notts. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Field, Rev. Arthur T.; Rector of Ryther, Tadcaster. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Gray, Rev. Walter A., M.A., Vicar of Arskey, Doncaster; Rector of Croughton, Brackley, Oxfordshire. Patrons the Trustees.

Greenwood, Rev. Robert, L.Th.; Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Westleigh, Manchester. Patron, the Vicar of Leigh.

Griffiths, Rev. James, B.D., late Vicar of Llangranog, Cardiganshire; Vicar of Llanguicke, Glamorganshire. Patron, the Bishop of St. Davids.

Hartley, Rev. William R.; Vicar of Rookhope, Durham. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Hickson, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Curate of St. Michael and All Angels, Croydon; Vicar of St. Martin's Low Marple, Cheshire. Patron, Miss Hudson.

Horton, Rev. Reginald, M.A., Vicar of Dymock; Vicar of All Saints', Clifton.

Hurst-Jones, Rev. Douglas, M.A., Curate of Linslade, Bucks; Private Chaplain to the Countess of Rothes.

Jones, Rev. Isaac, late Curate of Felinfoel, Carmarthenshire; Vicar of Granston-with-St. Nicholas, Pembrokeshire. Patron, the Bishop of St. Davids.

Jones, Rev. Jonathan Marsden, B.A., late Curate of Llangattock-with-Llangenny; Rector of Cathedine, Brecon. Patron, Sir Joseph Russell Bailey, Bart., M.P.

Lambert, Rev. Edgar, M.A., Chaplain Mission to Seamen, Sunderland; Rector of Heene, Worthing. Patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Lane, Rev. Charlton George, M.A., Rector of Lower Gaddesden; Rural Dean of Berkhampstead.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blakelock, Ven. Ralph, Rector of Giningham, Norfolk, in 1833, on the 1st inst., aged 88.

Bleeck, Rev. Alfred George, late Vicar of 'Preshute, at 14, Beaconsfield-road, Clifton, on the 3rd inst., aged 65.

Dickson, Rev. Francis John, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, Vicar of Ribchester, Lancashire, and previously Rector of Bispham, suddenly, on the 7th inst., aged 44.

Kelly, Rev. James, for twenty-nine years Incumbent of St. George's Church, Liverpool, at 15, Hatherley-street, Prince's-road, Liverpool, on the 2nd inst., aged 85.

Lambert, Rev. Henry, M.A., for twenty-seven years Rector of Goodnestone and Vicar of Graveney, at Graveney Vicarage, Faversham, on the 4th inst., aged 55.

Lofty, Rev. Fitzroy Fuller, M.A., late Rector of Whitchurch, Ross, at 7, Ravenswood-road, Redland, Bristol, on the 2nd inst.

Mozley, Rev. Arthur, Rector of Plymtree, Devon, at the residence of his brother, the Rev. Thomas Mozley, of 7, Lansdown-terrace, Cheltenham, on the 4th inst., aged 72.

Simmins, Rev. J. G. Rector of St. James's Church, Edinburgh, at 5, Eildon-street, Edinburgh, on the 20th ult.

Tuffnell, Rev. Thomas Pilkington, M.A., at Wormingford Vicarage, Colchester, on the 26th ult., aged 72.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE VALUE OF A PERSONAL GOD.

By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Pembroke College, Oxford, Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, October 25th, 1891.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me."—Exodus xx. 3.

IN no part of the Church does that code of morality known as the Ten Commandments occupy so prominent a place as in the Church of England. We teach it to our children from their earliest years in the Catechism. It is placed in the forefront of the divine Liturgy, the service for the Holy Eucharist itself. It is appealed to as a standard of self-examination by which to try our lives and conversations before we receive the Holy Sacrament. It was even ordered by the canons to be set up on the walls of our churches. Neither was this altogether a new thing coming in with many other changes at the Reformation, for at least 300 years previously it had been customary to recite the Decalogue publicly, and to explain it once every quarter. And yet it is a subject about which there is no slight misconception. Some say why read "this Riot Act" before the highest office of Christian love? In its extremest form it has been asserted that a Christian can only acquiesce in the position which it thus occupies "under protest." Men seem to forget altogether that the author of these stern precepts is God and not Moses; to forget that our Lord had said He came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil, that till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Surely we are in danger of running too hard the theory of the progressive character of morality as revealed in the Bible. One who will ever be remembered with veneration and love in the Church of England said, with far greater truth, "The Ten Commandments are at this moment the moral rule of Christendom, and contain in a compendious form an exhaustive statement of human duty towards the Author of our being and towards our fellow-creatures." I venture to ask with all reverence, Would the Beatitudes, would the simple recapitulation of the law, as given by our blessed Lord, the law of the love of God, the law of the love of our neighbour, meet so well the everyday needs of our teeming multitudes, who need a bristling hedge of command between them and the howling wilderness of sin? We talk about the low morality of the Jews, and our progress and our advancement, and yet is it for us to cast the stone? Do we not need such simple precepts as the sixth, the seventh, the eighth, as much as ever, on the most superficial estimate? The higher law of holiness is impossible without the lower law of morality, just as brilliant attire is a poor substitute for personal cleanliness. No, we may depend upon it, we are not going to rule these commandments out of court by a supercilious stroke of the pen, dictated by a hurried inspection and imperfect estimate of their meaning. Their true position cannot be better expressed than this, in the words of one who had carefully tested the depths of God's teaching, both in the Old and New Testaments: "They—namely, the precepts of the law—set forth certain principles of the eternal law of morality by taking them, as it were, at its lowest possible point, at which their violation sinks to the level of direct grievous sin of the most obvious and unquestionable heinousness. The letter of the law forbids, for instance, murder and adulteries, and yet we instinctively feel that the principles of the natural law which are thus defended (as it were on their remotest frontier) exact the custody of the thoughts and desires of the heart as well as the abstinence from outward sin. Thus the faithful Christian who passes his life in the strength of sacramental grace and of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, free from any deliberate sin whatever, can find in the prohibitions of the Decalogue, as he is taught to understand them, an adequate code for his own continual self-examination." Neither, let us remember, are these laws arbitrary. Righteousness is not right because God commands it; sin is not sinful merely because He forbids it. But everything that He commands is right, and everything that He forbids is sinful.

I. Now, in looking at the first of these commandments, we are struck at once with this significant fact, here is a code of morality which begins with a matter of Faith. Where are courage, truthfulness, justice, temperance and the like, which we are accustomed to see in the forefront of natural morality? Surely it is the eternal sanction of the Creator of the world, appended for ever to this great fact, that man being what he is, morality of any kind to the greatest number, the highest morality to all, is only possible under the sanction of the eye of a personal God, by the supernatural help which He alone can give, by the higher spiritual insight which He only can bestow. Thou shalt have a God, this seems to be the floating idea out of which is shaped the definite image of the first commandment. A God to whose eye you may constantly direct your gaze, so as to know by an indication, by a gesture, His Divine will, not a mere creature, or some power of nature, not the malignity of an animal, nor the beauty and glory of the heavens, but one whose gaze is ever fixed upon the very inmost life. A presence about our

path, about our bed, and spying out all our ways. It is the setting up of a personal God as a principle of morality. Higher than the mere empire of the will, higher than the mere aiming at a lofty ideal. This is what man shrinks from. This is what he is brought back to, as the very foundation of the simplest morality, contact with God, relation with a Divine Person, who approves or reprobates, who helps us to attain to that which He orders, "giving us according to His Divine Power, all things that pertain unto life and godliness through the knowledge of Him that hath called us to godliness and virtue."

The setting up the presence of God. It is necessary to insist on this in the very forefront of Divine morality, because to be quite sincere, this Divine commandment appeals to us, not so much as to the question whether we shall have many gods, but whether we shall have any God at all. The world spirit invades our very soul; it shapes our thoughts, it dominates our conversation, it colours our estimate of the phenomena of life. We know a great deal of secondary causes, we observe, we compare, we generalise, we deduce. But we stop short of the Personal first cause. In a verdict given the other day in the case of a death by lightning, the jury brought in, "Death from exhaustion following shock caused by being struck by lightning," on which the coroner dryly remarked, "The old verdict used to be 'Death by the visitation of God.'" "An extraordinary coincidence," if he believed in it at all, would probably be the comment of the modern journalist, instead of the simple statement of the old prophet, "Now God had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah."

Do not let us be unjust. There may be behind it all a sincere recognition of the Presence of an unseen God, whom reverence elevates upon a pedestal, to be recognised with awe, rather than appealed to with familiarity, still it is there, that world spirit, we cannot deny it. The Egyptian saw the Nile fertilising his land: it became his god. It was a simpler and easier belief than the worship of an imaginary being in the clouds. So we see our workshops guided by almost superhuman intelligence, worked with admirable industry, turning out fresh triumphs of mechanical skill; we do not worship the inventors, nor sacrifice to the machinery, but our thoughts stop at what we see. We are not in a supernatural mood, we are practical, we do not quite see where a god would come in, we say nothing, we are content. The savage again sees some evil beast seize his child and devour it, it is a power of evil, it has strength, it has malignity, it must be appeased, he worships it. Again, it is easier than to worship an abstract Divinity in an unknown heaven. We, on the other hand, see disease mowing down our friends and relations. Medical science investigates its immediate causes, it relieves, it cures, it prevents. We do not offer incense to the physician, or decree an altar to his science, but we are content, we stop; we speak contentedly of sanitation, we speak contentedly of laws of health and medical skill. Of course we know that no man is exempt, but we go in faith, it is enough. Again, we are practical. Turn where you will there is this reluctance to have to do with a personal God, a shrinking from His presence. Life becomes like some lovely valley which a factory or mining operations have invaded. There rise up the tall chimneys, and the streets of worksheds, and the clatter of machinery echoes over the hills, the green fades out of the grass, and the beauty from the flowers, and the blue from the sky, and the tenderness from the landscape. So place after place, full hitherto of the felt presence of God, is being invaded. There is activity, there is work, there is material progress, but what if we are losing an ineffable beauty, a presence out of life?

> The world is too much with us; late and soon,
> Seeking and spending, we lay waste our powers.
> Little we see in nature that is ours;
> We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon.

Ah, we must all feel it, not too many gods, no God at all. Where is the reality of our devotion or piety. We confess our faith in the Creed, but it is not real. We say our prayers to God, we do not feel them. We praise Him mechanically. We obey His laws, because if we transgress they sharply pull us up. But how many of us can say, "O God, Thou art my God"? How many of us feel around and about us the greatness higher than ourselves—that unerring wisdom, that neverfailing love, a personal Friend. "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."

II. Now, this want of contact with a personal God is not a sentimental grievance, it is a practical loss. To us, just as truly as it did to the Israelites, the right belief in a personal God stands in the forefront of our morality. (1.) For when Israel of old ceased to feel God's presence, what did they see? Only the peculiarity of their position. Here they were—a nation without a head, with no king to fight their battles, no centre of unity, no representative of their corporate life. Here they were, hedged in by restrictions of all sorts, with a costly system of sacrifices, an exacting round of devotion, with its distinction of clean and unclean meats, with severe penal enactments, with stern moral laws. Other nations had kings, other nations had a greater freedom, and less engrossing ties of all sorts. When God had ceased to be felt, when they had shrunk far enough back from contact with Him, then their whole life became a weariness and a burden—just as you may see some magnificent window, with its wealth of colour, through which the sun pours with its breathing light—

> The saints are there;
> Christ s ever growing light,
> Through heavenly features grave and fair,
> Is gleaming—all the lonely air
> Is thronged with shadows bright.

But look again, when night has come on, and the light has faded away, then it has become a grim wall of lead and glass and nothing more. So, when God is missed out of life, there only remains in religion bare and gaunt ordinance, stern, unbending, gloomy, without light and love. So it was with Israel in its growing apostacy. So it is with us; if we are out of touch with God, if we cease to feel His presence, then we lose all reverence for His plan. Why do we need a Church, with its routine and its drudgery, its slavish rites and ceremonies, its dogmatic precision, its uncompromising exclusiveness? Why should we pay tithes in hard times like these? Why should we not accommodate ourselves to the age? Our soul loatheth this light bread; sacraments are obsolete. What need is there for these highly paid officials, bishops and clergy,—why are not clergy elected by the congregation, or simply set apart as they are in other bodies? The Church is too narrow, too confined in her sympathies, with no elasticity of doctrine, no expansion of system under the pressure of these times. Supernatural claims may be all very well, but we do like common sense.

My brethren, it is a serious thing when men cease to feel God, or, in the words of the commandment, to have a God, when His light dies to them out of sacrament and service, and the methods of the Church, because it is paving the way to a great apostacy.

Every unreal prayer, every neglected sacrament, every careless communion, every misspent Sunday is just causing you to turn your back a little more and a little more upon God. And that sense of leaning upon something which is in you rather than in Him, will drive you away to look at the kings of the nations, to call privilege peculiarity, and service servitude, and restraint slavery, and the great Church system a failure. It will penetrate to your own inmost lives. Directly the word or the service of God becomes unreal to us, we shall feel peculiar—the old familiar topics will seem strange to us. We shall toss aside the ancient history of Balaam, or the troubles of Daniel, or the sins and punishment of God's people, and betake ourselves to the *Times*. We shall feel that if a service is to be palatable at all, that it must at least be wrapped up in good music, otherwise it would seem strange to be found frequently at Church, when there is so much that is exciting in the world around us. But a person who knows what it is to have God does not stop to ask about, or think of such things; he feels his blessings not his isolation, his privileges not his peculiarity.

It is a sign that we are feeling the keen thrust of this commandment, we are pressing against its thorny barrier, if we feel only the contrast between religion and the world. I will do as others do—I want a king, like the rest of the nations. It is, in fact, asking for another god, a god who demands no strictness of life, no all-engrossing faith, no duties of worship, no chain of sacraments, but a religion which, while it lulls the conscience and satisfies the feeble religious sense, awakens no responsive sympathy with the presence of God.

(2.) "None other gods but Me." Once more. When Israel loses the guidance of the eye of God, he feels the heaviness of His hand. The discipline of life vexes and annoys him; he loses reverence for God's will concerning him. Ah! when the love of God is gone, He is then chiefly felt as one who spoils pleasures, and frustrates plans. "The Lord refuseth to give me leave to go with you," said Balaam. "For forty years suffered He their manners in the wilderness," is the indictment against Israel; rebellion against God is the inevitable sequel when we cease to reverence Him. How terrible to see the Kibroth-hataavah, the lusting after forbidden things, in the face of centuries of warning and a long record of experience, as if God did not know, as if the law of God did not exist, as if it were possible to attain to pleasure through such things.

How terrible to see the worship of the golden calf, as if money and luxury were the gods which led up out of Egypt into a promised land; how sad to hear the murmuring against Moses and Aaron, the discipline and teaching of God's laws; how sad to see the weary, disconsolate aimlessness of life, under God's chastisement, where all love for Him has fled, then the distaste for even life itself—"Let us die, for to-morrow we eat and drink." Here, too, it is a sign that we have ceased to have God, that we have lost our reverence for Him, our contact with Him, our sense of His presence, if we are full of this indolent rebellion of complaint, and sullen perversion of His plan. God's method is so wonderful. Life, as we look back over it, is like some great city which bears on its face the marks of catastrophe to those who know, only of improvements and marvellous development to those who gaze at it superficially. Here a great fire has cleared a splendid area, where now some noble building makes a feature in the city. Here houses have fallen in, here squalor and oppression have done their worst, and brighter homes and wider streets spring up on the ruins. So with our life. God's loving kindness and mercy has followed it, like some skilled architect. He has seized upon our very falls, and beautified our very defects, and turned the uneven corners into beauties, obstinacy into firmness, rashness into courage, extravagance into liberality. But when we lose our reverence for His plan, we mar and deface what He has done. We are like savages in the midst of beauty; yes, the rebellion of complaint, the rebellion of a life alienated from Him, is another form of that sin, which puts other gods in the place of God—self will, self-pleasing, indolence, ease, selfishness in every form; it says to the powers of this world, "These be thy gods, O

Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt."

(3.) Lastly, Israel loses its reverence for God. It ceases to have a God when it ceases to love the thing which God commands, and to desire that which He doth promise. Want of reverence for God's promise, as well as God's methods and God's plans, produced the national apostacy from Him. Canaan ceased to be a reality, or even an aim. When it was near it seemed too difficult, and spies brought back an evil report of it.

Do we really love the things which God promises us? Are our lives really shaped by a promise? Is heaven a reality, or is death the grim barrier, which shuts in all life worthy of the name? Do we realise the beauty of holy things, or is it only a figure of speech to us? Let us be quite sincere on this point. It has been said, "It is painful to be told that anything is very fine and not to be able to feel that it is fine; something like being blind while people talk of the sky." So it is with so many things: people talk of the beauty of the Bible; they say, "Thy word is a lantern to my feet and a light unto my path." They really mean it, they really feel it. There is patience in it, and comfort in it. "How dear are Thy counsels unto me, O God." Do we find it so? Do we love it to this extent? Do we read it? On any given day, which would we rather be without—the Bible or the daily paper?

So again with the Holy Communion. Listen to St. Bernard walking up and down in his cloister before celebrating, hear him say:

> Jesu, the very thought of Thee,
> With sweetness fills the breast;
> But sweeter far Thy face to see,
> And in Thy presence rest.

Do we find it so? We are a little unreal in these matters. We allow our tongues to drag along our mind, an unheeding or even an unsympathetic companion. We languidly wish we had lived in the days of Christ; it would have been something to have seen one miracle, to have heard one parable. But Christ is here, and we do not come to meet Him. So it is with heaven itself. It is an easy thing to say

> O Paradise, O Paradise, I greatly long to see
> The special place my dearest Lord is furnishing for me;

or

> Jerusalem, my happy home, would God I were in thee.

And it is not only our hymn-books, the inspired psalms are strung just as high. We say these things; do we mean God to take us at our word? Let us be sincere. It is a terrible thing to wake up and feel that it is all a hollow mockery; we cannot feel that we have God, and there is a loneliness and fear, while religion seems all wrapped up in mystery and shrouded in unreality. We call out for new gods, for as for this Moses we wot not what has become of him.

III. And yet it is worth the struggle—to have God—the very difficulty of the approach to Him is the measure of its importance. The Church is not the plan, it may be, which human nature would have devised; but Jesus Christ devised it, and in reverencing it we reverence Him.

The discipline of life which He puts upon us is not the precise discipline which we should have chosen for ourselves, but in submitting to it we shall feel a power higher than ourselves, to which the common consent of mankind has given the right of government, when it speaks of Providence, which foresees in its two senses of prevision of the future, and provision for our needs. The promises of God transcend the grasp of our mind: they can only be reached by a struggle. But in reverencing them, we reverence Him who gave them. Let us try to enter fully into these things, and gain for ourselves the guidance of God's eye; for the first step to rebellion is to lose the sense of His Presence, and to lose the sense of His Presence is but to feel our loneliness. And then wandering about, amidst desecrated shrines and deserted temples, we throw ourselves upon the gods of the nations from utter loneliness, and the restlessness of the craving heart. But there stands, a menace if you will, but at the same time a most blessed warning, barring the way to that wilderness where lie the bleaching bones of religions which have utterly failed to help or save wandering humanity. "I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have no other gods before Me."

BURIAL REFORM.

By the Rev. F. LAWRENCE, B.A., Vicar of Westow, York, Hon. Sec. of the Church of England Burial, Funeral and Mourning Reform Association.

Sermon Preached in Grace Chapel, New York, on Sunday, September 9th, 1888.

"And Aaron shall be gathered to his fathers."—Numbers xx. 26.

THE text does not mean that Aaron's body was to be gathered to his fathers, but he himself, apart from his mortal body, which, after death, is the

> "Worn out fetter which the soul
> Has broken and cast away;"

And which is sown a natural body, to be raised a spiritual body.

Bishop Butler wrote—"Our organised bodies are no more ourselves, or part of ourselves, than any other matter around us." To leave no doubt of his meaning, he continued, "our gross organised bodies with which we act are no part of ourselves." And St. Paul enforces the same truth. The fact is, my real self is apart from the organs which make up my natural body. The essential part of me is the spiritual part. I am a spiritual being who have a body. My real self is built up every day until I am what, for the most part, I have

made myself. What is called my character, that I am, in which death makes no change. It is not I who die, but this organised body in which I have dwelt; while I myself am gathered to my fathers, as Aaron was, to be united at the appointed time with a spiritual body, and live on for ever.

The right view of the life here is that it is an integral part of the life hereafter. The Christian life is a continuous progress in which there is no break. Christ's words are: "He that believeth on Me hath eternal life," and "He that believeth on Me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth on Me shall never die." What is called death is an event on the way, "the long breath which our souls draw when they enter Paradise." The dead are the dead bodies that are laid in the cemetery to be dissolved. The departed are they who are gathered to their fathers, as Aaron was, to live on for ever.

Now, many, who spend their energy and their time regardless of the eternity to which they belong, to all intents and purposes, do not believe in the continuity of life after death. In respect of their higher affections, they are "cabined, cribbed, confined," nay, coffined, coffined in the three score years and ten of this life. To such, the earthly body is the chief concern; and hence, a materialism which bears evil fruit, not only here, but after death. The body, which has received inordinate regard when alive, receives undue and improper attention when dead, and, out of this, arise many of the evils which have gathered around our mode of disposing of the dead.

1. The dead body is retained too long unburied, whereby the last recollection of the ineffable beauty which is the peculiar characteristic of the recently dead is marred, and the body suffers an indignity from which it should be spared. Only those whose dwelling-place consists solely of one room know how great is this evil.

2. The body of a rich man is placed in a strong durable coffin of lead, or wood—sometimes expensively mounted and upholstered as if it was intended for use in daily life—in which the body generates poisonous gases and fluids; while the body of a poor man is laid amidst other dead bodies in a common grave which is kept open from day to day until it is filled by the dead. Thus, not only are the dead dealt with irreverently, but disregard is had to the public welfare. One part of a cemetery is filled with vaults tenanted in perpetuity by dead men's bones and all uncleanness; while, in another part, over-crowding fouls the water-springs, poisons the soil, and gives rise to emanations, which, if not themselves the causes of disease, are yet instrumental in impairing the vitality, or power of resistance to morbid influences, of the surrounding population. An eminent sanitarian has stigmatised such modes of burial as horrible, prejudicial to the health of the living, and repugnant to the feelings of every man; while another has said that if the present mode continue there will be some terrible pestilence, like one of the plagues of former centuries.

3. There is an expenditure often out of all proportion with the means of the bereaved, and generally in a wrong direction, and this expense is often incurred while the body itself is denied proper burial; the body being either dishonoured by nominal burial in a solid coffin, where it is shut out from natural processes, or unhonoured by imperfect burial amidst other bodies in an already-crowded grave.

4. There is much unnecessary show, often in the worst possible taste. Here, are the black hearse with the nodding plumes, the sombre trappings, and the mourners covered with crape. There, the laboured efforts of the over-burdened bearers occasion anxiety, confusion, and distress, as the huge weighty coffin is let down into its place. Elsewhere, the grave is marked by the unmeaning urn, or decked with artificial wreaths in porcelain or zinc which teach no lesson, but are mere make-believes in the midst of stern, awful, realities.

5. In many parts the custom still obtains of providing much refreshment, and the distinctively religious character of the funeral is almost lost sight of. Arrived at the church, the mourners sit through the service as though they at least had no part in it, as if the service was simply a function for putting the body away. Then back to the house of mourning to eat and drink, the widow making it her chief source of comfort that she has "buried her dead decently." Is this not mostly "of the earth, earthy," with death, the world, and the flesh having the pre-eminence, and Christ and His Church in the back-ground?

Wherein lies the remedy? In right views of life and death, of the relationship of the body to the true personality, and of the honour due to the human body.

The Christian is comparatively only beginning to live when that happens to him which is called death. He himself is then gathered to his fathers, into a higher sphere of existence, having no further use for the earthy corruptible body in its present condition, which has now its own functions to perform in the great cycle of nature, preparatory to its recall under changed conditions in the great hereafter. The body will, therefore, be laid into the earth as soon as signs of dissolution begin to appear, and this as completely as decency and reverence permit, in a coffin, such as that suggested by Mr. S. Haden, constructed not with a view to its endurance, but to its perishability, made, not of lead, nor even of durable wood, but of such materials as shall give it all the essentials of a strong coffin, be not remarkable in appearance and yet will yield, after interment, and expose the body to the action of the earth and air. And an effort will be made to have the burial in earth

sufficient and suitable for the resolution of the body into its constituent elements in accordance with sanitary laws, which demand that the health of the living be taken into account. Thus buried, the body which was "fearfully and wonderfully made," "the tenement of an immortal soul," "the temple of the Holy Ghost," is consigned to His keeping Who secretly fashioned it as it pleased Him, and Who will as secretly dissolve it, now that it has served its purpose. As the leaf falls upon the ground, and is gradually absorbed into the earth, so the human body, if properly buried, is dissolved by natural processes, quietly and gently, according to natural laws, and disappears as God provided. And, instead of a family vault or mausoleum, there will be a family plot kept (it may be) as a small garden, wherein the dead are buried, side by side, in the frailest possible casket, the earth being ready, generation by generation, to receive the dead of that same family for any time to come. And to the dead of the very poor will be shown, if possible, the honour due, earth suitable and no over-crowding; and no greater honour than this can be shown to the dead of the very rich.

A cemetery thus used would not be an accumulation of human remains in every stage of arrested and prolonged decay, too vast for earth and air to purify and disintegrate, but a place where the dead, unobstructed by that which retards dissolution, pass away imperceptibly, to the harm of none, and leave the earth ready to perform its beneficent action again.

Here, however, arises the important question of the extra expense entailed by the provision of enlarged spaces of land. But there is a means of meeting this seeming difficulty. It is natural and becoming in the bereaved to give expression to their affection by some appreciable outlay, and in this they are supported by Christ Himself, Who defended the expenditure of a considerable sum solely on the ground that it was for His burial. Why should not the amount given out of respect for the departed be expended, not in the purchase of a costly coffin, or in other outward show, but in providing a proper earthern grave where the body can lie undisturbed, until the earth and air have dissolved it, and set it free? And this mode of burial in proper graves need not be so costly as it seems, because, if the coffins be always perishable, the earth will be occupied only during the brief period of dissolution, instead of for all time, and be available for continuous use generation by generation; while the rich, if so minded, can honour their own dead by providing the poor proper places of rest for their dead.

And in regard to the ceremonial to be observed, much can be learned from David who, when his child was at last dead, "rose up and washed his face and ate bread," and who, when expostulated with, said, "Now that he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." Much also can be learned from the early Christians at Rome who, when they bore to the catacomb the body of a martyr, carried each an olive, or a palm branch, in token of victory, discarded the use of black attire as unfit to be worn for those who were washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb, lifted up hands and eyes without doubt or fear to heaven, singing "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints," and, above the grave-place, inscribed the words "in peace," for he, whose body they buried, was himself gathered to his fathers, as Aaron was, in peace.

The Christian moves forward through this life, a citizen of the unseen world. Consciousness of the sublime future which awaits him after death purifies, ennobles, and glorifies every thought and word and act. As time advances, his faith in the life to come is deepened and quickened. At death he bids good bye to his earthly companion, the mortal body, which is laid into the earth "in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ, Who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be like unto the body of His glory, according to the mighty working, whereby He is able to subdue all things to Himself." Thus is he "gathered to his fathers," to his own people, to await his "perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory." At the appointed time will come the uprising of the body. That which is "sown in corruption" shall be raised "in incorruption," that which is "sown in dishonour" shall be "raised in glory," that which is "sown in weakness" shall be "raised in power." "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." The uprising of that which has died is manifested all around us: in the budding leaf, and in the opening flower. And the new life of the soul and body reunited shall be as much higher, richer, fuller, more complex, and more beautiful, as the life of the plant is than that of the bare grain in the earth beneath. And as Christ in His glorified body appeared not to strangers but to those whom He had known and loved before He died, so he who has followed in his footsteps on earth, and be truly "gathered to his fathers," to his own people, to his own place, where "God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more;" "and there shall be night no more; and they need no light of lamp, neither light of sun; for the Lord God shall give them light; and they shall reign for ever and ever." "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

THE Grocers' Company have made a donation of £100 to the Curates' Augmentation Fund.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXI. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1892.

WELL DONE, MY LORD.

THE Bishop of Worcester has answered the fool according to his folly. Some intelligent persons having besought him for a dispensation from the obligation of fasting this Lent, he has replied that he could not grant one, because he knew of no such obligation. We hope the bishop's answer will commend itself to those prelates, of whom the Archbishop of Canterbury is one, and the Bishop of Exeter, we regret to say, another, who have easily assumed these powers. Sooth to say, there is no folly of which sensitive religious people seem incapable. If there is one thing from which we hoped the Reformation had freed us, one fetter of formalism and literalism which we trusted had been broken any time these 400 years, it was this very vanity of mortifying the flesh instead of the spirit, giving the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul. And yet here we are, at the end of the nineteenth century, the very air we breathe pregnant with thought, and every sound of life full of serious religious problems—we are living on the battle-ground of all the conflicting methods of inquiry and speculation as to human and Divine matters. And amid all this, some, at least, of our bishops and archbishops are gravely considering and seriously treating mere whims and fancies, shreds and patches of ancient superstition and modern folly. If this rubbish of fasting and penance formed a real and important part of our religious system, as it does in the Roman Catholic Church, we might take it more seriously, even if the mortification of the flesh, though foolish, were genuine, we might at least respect it.

> Can any man of common sense
> Think eating meat gives God offence,
> Or that a herring hath a charm,
> The Almighty's anger to disarm?

Well, if any man really does think so, and conscientiously acts upon his belief, we may regret that he is so foolish, but we may credit him with being sincere. But when this is not the case, when it is not even a red herring, so to speak, that is drawn across the trail of Divine responsibilities, but, in its stead, those dainty compositions of which the recipes fill several pages of various weekly papers every Lent—when, in fact, the alleged mortification becomes downright indulgence, not only of the body, but of the spirit, which is blown out with self-satisfaction at penance easily accomplished and virtue pleasantly achieved, then it is time to protest against the folly and the mischief, and especially against the encouragement of it by the powers that be. In many quarters a modern English Lent is a season of sensation and diversion of a mildly religious type, capable of nothing serious, and effecting nothing good, but affording an excuse for a little change and some agreeable exercise for elastic consciences; it just suits the easy-going Pharisees of both sexes, who, if they are only trifling sinners, are far enough from being saints; but to call it religious, to take this delicate folly and offer it to God, is offensive as well as absurd. The excuse may be given that different people are religious in different ways, and that room must be made for all. This is rank abuse of sensible truth. So long as a man is really religious the expression of his religion may be left to himself. But when he merely pretends to be, or at best fancies he is, and imagines he is faithful when he is only a fool, to leave him alone, or to encourage him, is poor humanity and worse religion. Such a man wants shaking up, wants convincing that the cross he has to bear is not set with brilliants and hung round his neck. It is all very well to make playthings of penance and pastimes of penalties, but it does not do the world any good; and we recommend to the bishops the excellent example of the first to do the work of their order, though it is not recorded that they ever bore the title or enjoyed the dignities, "it is not meet to leave the word of God and serve tables."

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE FUTURE STATE OF THE UNSAVED.

BY ARTHUR J. MELHUISH, F.R.A.S.

IT appears to me that the Scriptures are not quite so reticent on the subject of the future state as seems generally supposed, and that if we allowed ourselves to be "taught of God," rather than to be taught of men, we need not be so uncertain of the future state, as most of us are content to be. Once our Lord drew aside the veil, and gave us, by a parable, a picture of the state of the wicked after death, and I think that if we are willing to learn of Him who "spake that which

He *knew*, and testified that which He had *seen*," we may learn much from the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, for we are plainly taught :

1. That the misery of the wicked is extreme. He who "fared sumptuously every day" is described as parched with thirst, "tormented in this flame," and denied even a drop of water to cool his tongue; it is therefore certain that it is a fearful thing to fall (impenitent) into the hands of the living God.

2. That he who on earth was full of pride is so completely humbled that he prays that Lazarus, the once despised beggar, may be sent to cool his tongue.

3. That he who on earth was the personification of selfishness, in a short time—for His brethren are still alive—has become so unselfish, that when the alleviation he asks for himself is refused, his prayer is for others, that they may be led to repentance, and be spared the sufferings that he endures, indeed our Lord shows him to be now more anxious for others than for himself, for when refused the drop of water he says no more, but when his prayer for his five brethren is denied him he again urges it, "but if one went unto them from the dead they will repent."

4. That the fire and the torment are remedial, or if I may use a word that one is apt to associate with the corrupt use made of the doctrine by the Romish church, I would say Purgatorial. Pride is changed to humility, even self-abasement; and selfishness to earnest desire that his fellow-sinners may experience the easy repentance of this life rather than the agonising purgatory of the next.

5. One more truth we may learn from this impressive parable. That our Lord considers the evidences that He has given us of His revelation to man are not only sufficient, but that more would be of no avail.

Now from this divine teaching let us turn for a moment to the doctrines of men. Mr. Spurgeon in his, in many respects, truly valuable work "The Treasury of David," thus comments on Psalm v. 11, "But let all those that put their trust in Thee rejoice, let them ever shout for joy." He says, "Joy is the privilege of the believer; when sinners are destroyed our rejoicing shall be full, when they howl we shall *shout*, and as they must groan for ever, so shall we *ever shout* for joy."

It would be truly appalling if this Calvinistic view of the future condition of the majority of the human race were true ; but have believers in this awful doctrine ever realised what it means.

EVERLASTING TORMENTS :—No finite being can grasp the full meaning of these words, but let us try to picture to ourselves something far within the compass of them. There seems to be no limit to the extent of Creation. Let us suppose that the fixed stars are as numerous as the grains of sand, that each one is the centre of a solar system such as our own, and that every one is crowded with inhabitants like our little earth, then multiply the number by millions of millions, and let us suppose that all of that vast multitude were condemned to such millions of years of torment, that millions of miles of figures were required to express the period, still all that they all would suffer would be as nothing compared to the sufferings of *one soul* condemned to endless torment, for the former period is finite, but the latter is infinite. And what does this monstrous belief, this hideous libel on our Creator, rest upon ; how do its advocates attempt to prove it? By the character of the blessed God! Much as some cling to this "comforting doctrine," I think they would hardly dare to say that; they rely on the very questionable application of a Greek word. The character of God, as revealed to us by His Son, is dead against it. The solemn and unmistakable declaration of Christ is dead against it, for He said "And I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto Me." This is what our Lord said; but they say "No, Christ will do nothing of the kind," for do not lexicographers tell us that the word sometimes stands for unending. Paul is dead against it, for he says that "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." So says Paul; but the Calvinist says "no," and would have us believe that although Paul said "all," he did not *mean* "all," for what are the general teachings of the Scriptures and the character of God, who is "good to all," and whose "tender mercies are over all His works," and the words of Chrst, and the teaching of His servant Paul, compared to their own dogmatic rendering of one Greek word.

Let us look at the matter from another point of view. If every second of sin were punished by millions of millions of years of torment, that would be as nothing compared to what the wretch would have to endure who has to suffer endless punishment. We are told that every unpardoned sin shall receive its "just recompense of reward." Are millions of millions of ages the "*just* recompense of reward" for one second of sin ? Such a belief has I think only to be understood and *realised* to be scouted as a libel on the love and justice of our Creator by every intelligent mind.

Paul says, "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed" ; and is not that "another Gospel" which represents the blessed God as the enemy of the majority of the human race, holding their souls in existence in order to torment them. When announcing the birth of "a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord," the angel said, "Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people." This is *the* Gospel; but "another Gospel" says, "No, not to all, but to a chosen few, for the majority must suffer endless torment." God promised Abraham, "In thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed," referring, as all are agreed, to Christ ; but "another Gospel" says, "No, all the families of the earth shall not be blessed, but only an elect few."

The feeling of revulsion towards this shocking belief would be much more pronounced than it is were it not that there are many who, though they do not and cannot receive it, yet think that it might be dangerous to openly deny it, and that, even if it be a lie, it is at all events a safe and a wholesome lie, but this is weak, if not wicked, for like as all truth is of God, so all lies are of the devil. The belief of this lie has embittered the lives of thousands; it so horrified the gentle Cowper that at times it overpowered his reason, and the presentation of it as an integral part of the Christian religion has made more infidels than anything and everything else, and, as though this were not enough, the Calvinist tells us that none *can* escape the endless wrath of God except His chosen few, and that all others God has elected, or predestined to everlasting damnation. It would be difficult to conceive of "another Gospel" more calculated to wean the majority of mankind from the love of God than this. For my part I reject with scorn this "other Gospel," and am rejoiced to know that the Church of Christ is at length beginning to shake off the hideous nightmare that has too long oppressed it.

Reviews and Notices.

"FROM THE USHER'S DESK TO THE TABERNACLE PULPIT." The Life and Labours of Pastor C. H. Spurgeon." By Rev. R. Spindler. London: Passmore and Alabaster. Price 2s. 6d.

THIS record of the life and labours of the Rev. Charles Haddon Spurgeon will be read with intense interest by those who valued the earnest evangelical preaching of this holy man of God. His published sermons, which have a very large circulation, are much valued, and his death will be a great loss to numbers who were much refreshed and encouraged by his clear views on the Holy Scriptures and his simple teaching of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of sinners. This volume is rendered very attractive by its numerous illustrations, it is tastefully bound, and printed in a good type. When we peruse its pages we are struck by the numerous agencies employed by Pastor Spurgeon for the extension of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. His preaching and various missions were greatly blessed to thousands, and we earnestly hope that the various works connected with the Metropolitan Tabernacle will continue to be well supported, and that the Rev. James Spurgeon will be spared for many years to act as President. The proof sheets of this life were revised at Mentone, under Mr. Spurgeon's own supervision, and therefore this volume is doubly to be valued.

"MEMORIES OF STAMBOURNE." By C. H. Spurgeon and B. Beddow. London: Passmore and Alabaster. Price 1s.

WE recommend this little volume to the notice of our readers, and feel sure that all those who value the earnest efforts of the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon for the spiritual good of the vast multitudes with whom he came in contact will feel much interest in reading some of the incidents connected with his early life, and a few records of his grandfather, the Rev. James Spurgeon, who was the faithful and beloved pastor of the Independent Church at the little village of Stambourne for 54 years.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FAITH AS A FACULTY.

SIR,—Mr. Sandlands is certainly wrong in his exegesis of Eph. ii. 8. Especially he is wrong as to the reason he gives for τοῦτο being neuter. It cannot possibly be neuter as agreeing with τὸ θῶρον. Let him ask any fifth form schoolboy about that. I admitted that it might possibly not be neuter as agreeing with "your being saved through faith;" but if, as Alford maintains, it is not neuter for that reason, it is because it is used as καὶ τοῦτο often is, as meaning "and that thing." Being aware of this possibility I did not rest my argument on the neutrality of τοῦτο, but on the impossibility of the Apostle going on to say that "faith is not of works," as he must be understood to say by any one who maintains that he had said that faith is not of ourselves but is the gift of God. It may have some weight with Mr. Sandlands to know that Bishop Ellicott, Dean Alford, Bengel, Beza, etc., are all against him, and all agree with me in making τοῦτο mean our salvation not our faith.

Can a man pray for faith without exercising faith? Is it with a different faculty that a man believes a truth and believes a lie, believes and trusts his father, and believes and trusts in God? There are some truths so simple that it is hard to argue about them. One of them is that faith is a faculty wherewith God has endowed every reasonable human being, and for the use of which he must give account. Another is that it is to that very faculty that God addresses His word of truth. Yet another is surely this, that God can never condemn a man for not believing if He has never given him the faculty of faith without which he cannot believe. I can imagine few things more mischievous than to tell men that the faith with which a man believes the Gospel to the saving of his soul is a special faculty which God gives to some and not to others.

It would certainly justify unbelief to the mind of any unthinking man. Our Lord, without mentioning faith, except in the context, intimates that it is with the same faculty with which those who would receive Him, coming to them in His Father's name, would receive another coming to them in His own name. It is surely the same faculty of faith that was exercised in both cases of receiving.

It seems to me that all Mr. Sandlands' reasons for maintaining his position as given in paragraphs 3 and 4 of his letter are mere *petitiones principii*. There is scarcely a statement in them—not one that is at all relevant—that I would not simply contradict as untrue and contrary to fact.

If I had been in Pascal's place when the man said, "I can't believe," I would have answered him as civilly as possible—"You lie, you have faith or you could not believe me or any one else." And when the man went on to say: "Can you tell me how I can have faith?" I would have answered, "Use the faith God has given you"; and I would further have shown him reasons for believing the record God hath given of His Son, and that not believing that he was making God a liar.

Mr. Sandlands "has been," as he says, "thinking out this subject for a long time." Perhaps others who differ from him have been thinking it out quite as long or even longer, and to better purpose. What we want is some solid intelligible reasons for his thinking as he does, and these I do not think he has given us. I am glad of that, for I should be very sorry to be obliged by force of reason, or by testimony of Scripture, to adopt his conclusions. W. T. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas Vicarage, Douglas,
March 12th, 1892.

SIR,—I am not sure that the difference between Mr. Sandlands and myself is anything greater than about the use of terms, in which case it is not worth while to occupy your space with a discussion. But I rather think there is a further difference between us. Your correspondent says that fear, etc., are not faculties, but states of being. Faith is a state of being just as much as love and hope are states of being. Your correspondent, besides, calls the eye a faculty. I would not call it so—I would call sight a faculty. He says, also, that we call that faith which apprehends

revealed truth. I would not say this. I would say that it is through faith that spiritual truth is apprehended; spiritual truth, not revealed truth, for there are many things revealed in the Bible that are apprehended by the mere natural (or psychical) understanding. And I call the faculty which apprehends truth by faith, the spirit. In this I follow St. Paul, and his great expounder, Coleridge.

Now I don't know whether Mr. Sandlands accepts the Coleridgian metaphysics or not. The foundation of it is the recognition of the trinity in man of body, soul (ψυχή), and spirit. I am of the conviction that without this the Pauline theology cannot be, in any consistency, maintained.

How was Pascal reasoning in a circle when he said that submission to God's will would produce faith in God? Our Saviour said nearly the same, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of Myself."

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

March 14th, 1892.

SIR,—I do not intend to continue the controversy with Dr. Donaldson any further. With his method of controversy there is no reason why it should ever come to an end. There is nothing in his letter in the PULPIT of the 5th but what he has said before, and I could reply to it only by repeating what I have said before.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, March 8th, 1892.

P.S.—An accident prevented me from posting the above when written. I will only add my perfect agreement with Mr. Hobson's letter in the same PULPIT (March 5th) on the meaning of the word Faith, and on a current misinterpretation, or rather mistranslation, of Ephesians ii. 8.

March 11th.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION *VERSUS* AIONIAL PURGATORY AND ENDLESS TORMENT.

SIR,—I have been much interested in the letters that have appeared in your columns under the heading "Is there a Purgatory?" Some of your correspondents appear to hold that the revealed wrath to come on the finally impenitent will be limited in its duration and purgatorial in its effect. Others seem to believe they will be subjected to endless torment, in what has been truthfully, of course, and without exaggeration—even if figuratively—described as a lake of fire. I venture to say that the truth of the matter lies in neither of these directions; that the advocates of both theories of eternal punishment are right in much that they deny, and are wrong in very much that they assert. A is right in denying eternal torment as the destiny of the unsaved; B is right in denying that "eternal punishment" means a purgatory of limited duration. A, on the other hand, is wrong in asserting what B denies, and B is wrong in asserting what A denies. I believe the key of the problem consists in recognising two facts: (1.) That things are called eternal or everlasting in Scripture, which are everlasting or eternal in their result, though not in their process; (2.) That man has no eternal life or immortality of either soul or body in himself, and that "the wages of sin is death," "eternal death" as it is called in our Burial Service, "everlasting death" as it is called in our Catechism.

(1.) A very remarkable instance of the first of these two facts occurs in connection with what we read last Sunday in the first lesson for the morning—I mean the destruction of the cities of the plain in the time of Abraham and Lot. St. Jude, an inspired New Testament writer, tells us those cities "are set forth" in Genesis xix., of course, as "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Now the fire that consumed them is long since extinguished, they are not still in a state of conflagration. But it destroyed them utterly and for ever.

Another instance which is very much to the point is in Ps. xcii. 7-8, "When the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish; it is that they shall be destroyed for ever: But Thou, Lord, art the most high for evermore." Here what is eternal in its result though not in its process, the everlasting destruction of the ungodly, and what is eternal in duration of being and majesty are set one over against the other; just as in Matt. xxv. 46 the punishment of the wicked, which is eternal in its results not in its process, is set over against the life of the righteous which is eternal in its blessed process and actual duration. I suppose few will deny that to be "destroyed for ever" means a destruction which is everlasting in its result not in its process. It certainly means that in the case of Amalek in Numbers xxiv. 20, and also in the case of Israel, according to the lying prediction of Chemosh on the Moabite stone. So also in Ps. ix. 5, "Thou hast put out their name for ever and ever," no one surely supposes that it is an everlasting process (which is never accomplished) of putting out their name that is meant, but a putting out which, however brief and sudden in the process, is everlasting in its result, "Their memorial is perished with them" (v. 6).

(2.) The second fact is one that seems so obvious that I do not like to suppose that any of your readers will dispute it. It will be time enough for me to defend it when they do. But it seems very plain, and indeed it is admitted by most champions of the doctrine of eternal torment, that without the utterly unscriptural tenet of the immortality of the soul to back it up, eternal torment cannot be proved or maintained from Scripture. Scripture and it together *would* prove it to my mind. Scripture without it teaches not eternal torment, but something very different, viz., eternal death, everlasting destruction, in the Master's own words, the "destruction of both soul and body in hell" (Matt. x. 28).

I have no doubt that this is the primitive doctrine on this subject as held in the Church as well as taught in the New Testament, and I am glad to know that it is held by many of the soundest, and ablest, and most thoughtful ministers and members of our Church and of Nonconformist bodies.

VINDEX.

March 5th, 1892.

IS THERE A PURGATORY?

SIR,—I have every sympathy with "Vicar" in his search after truth. If controversialists would write in the same spirit as he does there would be less controversy. However, he has overlooked the fact that in the parable of Dives *it is not said* that Abraham was "asleep;" on the contrary, he is represented as

holding a conversation with Dives. "Vicar" thinks that the wish of Dives to send to his brethren was a good thing, and is puzzled to know how a person, possessed of any goodness at all, could be in hell. The answer is that natural affections are not spiritual affections, and that the former may exist where the latter are not found at all, even in minds otherwise well cultivated. By natural affections, I mean love to brethren, and such like; by spiritual affections, I mean love to God, and such like. Men are lost because they have no spiritual affections. Hence, in order to save the soul, we have the command, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." The man in whose heart this love is goes to heaven; all others go the other way. Our Saviour points out this distinction in Matthew xii. 46-50. When some one told Him that "His mother and His brethren stood without desiring to speak with Him", He answered and said, "Who is My mother? and who are My brethren? And He stretched forth His hand toward His *disciples* and said, Behold My mother and My brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of My Father, which is in heaven, the same is My brother, and sister, and mother." By which He meant to say that those who were His brethren naturally might not be His brethren spiritually, because they might not have the affections necessary to constitute them such, and that those only were His brethren who did the will of God, out of the principle that "love is the fulfilling of the law." That love is the quality without which no soul will be saved, St. Paul has distinctly told us in 1 Corinthians xiii.; wherein he tells us that "if he could speak with the tongues of men and of angels, if he had the gift of prophecy, if he understood all mysteries and all knowledge, if he had all faith, so that he could remove mountains, if he bestowed all his goods to feed the poor, and if he gave his body to be burned, and *had not love*, he would be *nothing*."

Duly considering this, it is not hard to conceive how Dives, though clad in purple, and faring sumptuously, and having the appearance of fraternal affection, should lift up his eyes in hell. I say the *appearance* of fraternal affection, because the man that does not love God does not love his brother properly. Spiritual affections purify the natural affections from the selfish subjective element that defiles them, causing them to have a *disinterested objective* tendency. We are unable, therefore, to say that the desire of Dives to send to his brethren was pure. Dr. Guyse paraphrases it thus: "And let him (Lazarus) warn them of the danger of treading in my steps, lest they share with me in my plagues, *and increase my guilt and torment*, for having drawn them into guilt by my example." This does not recognise any benevolent element in the wish; but the *root* of his whole misfortune was that poor Dives had not the love of God. He was "*nothing*" without it. This love does not spring up *naturally* in the heart; its cause is divine, being "shed abroad therein by the Holy Ghost" (Romans v. 5.) It must be carefully distinguished from mere human love, which so many people mistake for it. Many write and speak about the love *of* God, and love *to* God; but they are using these terms with only *natural* ideas. Their speech bewrayeth them that they know nothing of this heavenly principle. To be known properly it must be experienced, and experienced, too, in God's own way. It is the direct result of justifying faith (Romans v. 1-5.) The Prayer Book of the Church of England is full of it. Take, for instance, the Collect for the sixth Sunday after Trinity: "Pour into our hearts such love towards Thee"; also the first in the Communion Service: "That we may perfectly love Thee"; more especially the one for last Sunday (Quinquagesima): "O Lord, who hast taught us that all our doings without charity (love) are *nothing worth*: send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace, and of all virtues, *without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before Thee*." That this is scriptural is evidenced by St. Paul's prayer in Ephesians iii. 18, 19: "That ye may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to *know* the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge."

R. DONALDSON.

March 2nd, 1892.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Acland, Rev. Charles L., M.A., Head Master of the Royal Grammar-school, Colchester; Vicar of All Saints', Cambridge.

Atkinson, Rev. Henry Sadgrove, M.A., Vicar of Royston; Vicar of Darrington, near Pontefract.

Barrass, Rev. J. Stephen, Clerical Secretary to the Church of England Young Men's Society, and Chaplain of the Bethlehem Royal Hospital; Rector of St. Michael Bassishaw, London.

Barwell, Rev. A. H. Sankay, M.A., Rector of Clapham, with Patching; Rural Dean of Storrington, Division IV.

Boyle, Rev. Vicars A., M.A., Curate of St. Jude's, Whitechapel; Vicar of Burton-on-Trent.

Bright, Rev. Frederic A., Curate; Rector of Caterham, Surrey.

Brookham, Rev. Hugh James Thomas, Curate of Kirby-Muxloe, Glenfield, Leicestershire; Vicar of Kirtling, Newmarket.

Fairbairn, Rev. William Murray, B.A.; Rector of Loxbeare, Tiverton.

Farmer, Rev. J. E. G., M.A., Vicar of Millbrook; Vicar of Arundel.

Foyster, Rev. Henry C. B., M.A., Assistant-Curate, St. Andrew's, Earlsfield; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Lahore.

Gray, Rev. H. J. Spence, M.A., Chaplain of Meean Meer, Punjab; Chaplain of Murree.

Hill, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Ashurst; Vicar of Boxgrove, near Chichester.

Hudson, Rev. Thomas William, M.A.; Rector of Teigngrace, Devonshire.

Ivatt, Rev. A. W., M.A., Curate of St. James's, Bury St. Edmund's; Vicar of Fordham, Cambridgeshire.

James, Rev. Charles Lister, M.A.; Vicar of Broadhembury, Devonshire.

Johnson, Rev. C. B.; Rector of Enborne-with-Hamstead Marshall, near Newbury.

Kermode, Rev. S. A. P.; Vicar of Onchan, Douglas, Isle of Man.

Langhorne, Rev. W. H. Vicar of St. Luke's, Chatham-place, Hackney; Vicar of Walthamstow.

Lewis, Rev. John Henry; Rector of South Normanton, Derbyshire.

Lewis, Rev. John, Incumbent of St. Ann's, Hindsford, Manchester; Rector of Coates, Cambridgeshire.

Lindsey, Rev. Charles Edward Chaloner; Vicar of Wonastow, Monmouth.

Little, Rev. Harwood, B.A.; Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.

Long, Rev. Alfred, London Diocesan Home Missionary, Perpetual Curate of St. Saviour's, Hammersmith.

Lowe, Rev. F. E.; Assistant-Acting Chaplain to her Majesty's Forces at Malta.

Macmillan, Rev. Charles Duncan, Curate of Wakefield Cathedral; Vicar of St. John's, Wakefield.

Maddison, Rev. George Henry, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Tuckhill, Bridgnorth.

Michell, Rev. J. H., Senior Curate of St. Just-in-Penwith; Rector of St. Sennen, Cornwall.

Morris, Rev. William, B.A.; Perpetual Curate of Glyncorrwg-with-Blaengwrach, Neath.

Nutt, Rev. J. W., M.A., Rector of Chelsfield, Kent; Rector of Harpsden, Oxon.

Ogle, Rev. William Moss; Vicar of St. Bride's, Netherwent-with-Llandavenny, Monmouthshire.

Oliphant, Rev. C. J., M.A.; London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Owen, Rev. Crawfurd H. H. W., Senior Curate of Penge, Surrey; Rector of Thorpe Constantine, near Tamworth.
Parrish, Rev. Henry Griffin, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Wakefield; Surrogate for the Diocese of Wakefield.
Parsons, Rev. R. A., late Vicar of Worthington, Ashby-de-la-Zouch; Vicar of Long Buckby, Rugby.
Pearson, Rev. C. W.; Curate of Christ Church, Stafford, Curate-in-Charge of St. Stephen's Mission Church, Smethwick, Staffordshire.
Pollock, Rev. Herbert Charles, M.A.; Canon at Rochester.
Quarrington, Rev. E. F., M.A.; Honorary Canon and Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral.
Quilter, Rev. F. W., D.D., Rector of Martin Hussingtree; Vicar of Kempsey, Worcestershire.
Robertson, Rev. S. Richmond; Curate of All Saints', Vicar of St. Mary de Lode, Gloucester.
Roxby, Rev. Wilfrid, B.A., Rector of Thornford; Rector of Beer Hackett, Dorset.
Sandys, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Curate of St. Matthew's, Campfield; Secretary of the Manchester Diocesan Branch of the Church of England Temperance Society.
Sheppard, Rev. B. H., M.A.; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Barbourne, Worcester.
Short, Rev. Walter Francis, M.A., Rector of Donhead St. Mary, Salisbury; Rector of Saham-Toney, Norfolk.
Silverster, Rev. Joseph, M.A.; Incumbent of St. Mary's, Hawkshaw-lane, near Todmorden (New Church).
Skilton, Rev. W. J., M.A., Rector of Baldock; Rural Dean.
Slade, Rev. G. F., M.A., Rector of Buckland; Rural Dean of Reigate.
Springett, Rev. William D., D.D., Vicar of Herne-hill, Faversham; Rector of St. Andrew's, West Tarring, Worthing.
Sutton, Rev. C. N., Rector of North and East Marden; Rector of Withyham, Sussex.
Tetley, Rev. James George, M.A., Vicar of Highnam, Gloucester; Canon of Bristol Cathedral. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.
Thelwall, Rev. Sydney, Vicar of West Leigh, near Bideford; Vicar of Radford Semele, near Leamington.
Townson, Rev. Robert, M.A.; Vicar of Moulsford, Berks.
Twells, Rev. Richard Lionel, M.A., Vicar of Whaddon, Cambs, and Hon. Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Ely; Vicar of Hinxton, Saffron Walden.
Wallis, Rev. Frederick William, M.A., Curate of St. Stephen's, Worcester; Rector of Martin Hussingtree.
Ward, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Vicar of South Ossett, near Wakefield; Vicar of Earlsheaton, Yorkshire.
Williams, Rev. David; Vicar of Nantglyn, Denbigh.
Williams, Rev. Herbert, M.A., late Vicar of Rhryader; Vicar of St. John's, Brecon.
Wilton, Rev. A. S., B.A., Vicar of East Hardwick; Vicar of Askern.
Winter, Rev. Richard F., Curate of St. Nicholas's, Organising Secretary of St. Andrew's Waterside Church Mission; Chaplain of St. James's Cemetery, Liverpool.
Wood, Rev. Edwin G., M.A., Curate of St. Matthew's, Oakley-square; Curate of All Saints', Margaret-street.
Wren, Rev. Alfred Theodore, M.A.; Rector of Newton, Suffolk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bolden, John S., M.A., late Rector of Preston Bissett, near Buckingham, Bradford Abbas, Sherborne, on the 12th inst., aged 86.
Dickson, Rev. Francis John, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, Vicar of Ribchester, Lancashire, and previously Rector of Bispham, suddenly, on the 7th inst., aged 44.
Ellison, Rev. James, Vicar of St. George's, Sutton, Cheshire, on the 11th inst.
Marsham, Rev. Henry Phillip, at Rippon Hall, Norwich, on the 9th inst., aged 74.
Street, Rev. Benjamin, B.A., for thirty-four years Vicar of the parish, at the Vicarage, Barnetby-le-Wold, Lincolnshire, on the 7th inst., in his eighty-second year.
Torre, Nicholas Kirby, Priest-in-charge of St. Michael's, Bedminster, suddenly, in church, on the 4th inst., aged 58.
Wale, Rev. Henry John, M.A., youngest son of the late General Sir Charles Wale, K.C.B., of Little Shelford, Cambridge, at Bedford Park, on the 14th inst.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time my vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitated for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for morethan an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses Mr. Harness's Electropathic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restoring appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF POWER.

By the Right Rev. LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.

Sermon on the Death of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, preached in Ripon Cathedral, on Sunday, January 17th, 1892.

[*We are requested to state that this sermon is published only from the shorthand notes of a local reporter.*]

"Could not this man, which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died?"—St. John xi. 37.

THE question was asked on an occasion in which the public sentiment rose very high. It has, indeed, been thought by some that the question carries with it a touch of irony. Christ had restored a blind man to sight. There were some, you remember, who discredited the story, and it is imagined that those who were actuated by the same spirit of distrust now ironically put the question: If He who now weeps over the grave of Lazarus had possessed this power which is being claimed for Him, if He indeed opened the eyes of the blind, why could He not have saved this man from death by arresting his sickness? And from the apparent powerlessness of Christ with the cause of the disease of Lazarus they argued that Christ's miracle in regard to the blind man had not been a genuine one. But whatever way you interpret it, I think we can understand the sentiment which prompted the question. The occasion, as I said, was one in which public feeling was wrought to a very high pitch. The family of Lazarus was one that was held in esteem in the little village of Bethany; and the incident connected with his death had been one which appealed very largely to the affection and brotherly regard of the neighbours. It is quite true that a few days had elapsed since the death, but all the public feeling was awakened once more by the appearance of Christ upon the scene. Then there was a gathering of those who were interested. The friends of the family, one and another, trooped towards the grave, and they observed as the multitude gathered together that the central figure, Christ Himself, was deeply perturbed in spirit. And you know how quickly feeling runs from heart to heart, and when once the touch of tears reaches the soul, the spirits of men begin to tremble and thrill, and the bodily emotions are not far behind. Something like that, I think, must have run through the crowd; the appearance at the grave of the sisters, the sorrow of the Christ, the quick recollection of the pathos of the death, all concurred in exciting the emotions of the people; and then, as is so often the case, thought leaps quickly to the mind; arguments and questions which are begotten of the sentiment of the moment rush quickly from the heart and are forced to the lips, and we can understand that they who looked upon the sorrow of the Christ, seeing the sorrow of the sisters, touched for the moment by the sight of so many tears and the recollection of that pathetic loss, should have asked the question—Could He not have spared it all? Could He not, whose power was so great, have spared all this suffering, and arrested this disease, and so spared us from this hour? "Could not this Man, which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that this man should not have died?"

The feeling was perfectly natural. It was aroused by the emotions of the moment, and it is conceivable that if there were those who viewed the question from the sceptical side, there were those who viewed it from the side of simple thought. The difficulty presented to their minds was, if the Christ had this power why was it not exercised in this case. Why, if the power to save men existed, was that power not exerted in this moment. The feeling drawn from the picture is so pathetic it must stir the sentiment of those who have kindliness of heart. It has stirred the heart of the Healer Himself. Lo! He weeps in our midst. Why then is it conceivable that He should have stayed His hand? Why then if He possessed the power did He not use it? His appearance suggests that He Himself is interested in the loss. Why then did He stay His hand? These pictures of Christ do not stand in the Bible alone. The power of the Bible stories lies in the universality of its pictures. It is a picture which is being enacted often enough in the experience of many. What home and family have not had occasion to give utterance to a similar feeling? Could He not have spared it? If there be power in heaven and goodness in heaven, why was this blow allowed? How many, feeling that much was wrapped up in the life of him who was gone, have looked into the face of the future and seen reasons for apprehension; have looked into the heart of the present and have felt the emotions of sorrow; have looked back upon the past, and have only found that sorrow has been quickened into deeper intensity by the memory of what once was, and have burst out in the cry—"If there be power in the God of heaven, and goodness in His heart, why was not this power exercised? Why did not this goodness go forth? Could He not have spared me this blow? Could He not have left us this valuable life? Could He not, whose power is so great, have caused that even this man should not have died?"

To us, we might almost say, at this hour the question seems to have a certain significance for

the hopes and thoughts of a nation's sorrow, for surely we could imagine that there were few circumstances which were wanting to complete the pathos of the story which was closed last week. Not merely youth, which is always entrancing in its fascination, not simply youth, which precisely because hope and unachieved endeavour sit upon his crest fills us with the expectation and the imagination of what may be. Youth which is suddenly cut off is always a pathetic figure. It is the shattered column, or the flower which is not yet come to its full bloom; it is the bud which is plucked too early. We know under any circumstances that the death of youth, because it is incongruous, and because it cuts off so much from hope, has a pathos of its own. But here there were added elements; for the youth which was cut short was the youth which had just taken up the duties of life, and had taken up those duties with such unaffected simplicity that even though there was not as yet the very evidence of strength and of conspicuous power of achievement, there was such simplicity and such naturalness that one felt that the spirit of dutifulness towards life was present, and gave it the element of hope. Duties taken up with unaffected simplicity, duties discharged with pleasant graciousness which seemed to be an inherited power, and duties taken up also with a serious regard for the public interests of life, showed that there was a spirit behind which did not shrink from the task allotted to him. These duties were taken up and discharged in the remembrance of the needs of others. Let me remind you of the words spoken at the Shoeblacks' Institute:—"Lads, whoever you are, remember these two things—whatever you do, whether it be blacking boots, practising gymnastics, reading a book, or helping a friend, do it with your might. And remember also this other thing—whenever you are tempted to do wrong, whenever you are tempted to do a thing which seems to you to be pleasant and yet you know to be wrong, resist it manfully—bravely. Remember these two things." Surely whatever there might be in the heart that spoke these words, there at least was the recognition of this—the seriousness of public duties, and the desire to use them for the profit of those who heard. It is a life cut short,—a life of pleasing graciousness, a life of public conscientiousness, but a life also which was just upon the very threshold of those things which add to the charm and fascination of it. A life upon which hope hung, and round which brilliant prospects seemed to gather, had apparently reached the hour when those prospects were going to move forward towards greater and fuller realisation. A life, too, upon which that one charm had just fallen which, whatever may be said by men who have forgotten simplicity and affection, must always have its fascination for those who are simple and pure-hearted. The light and the brilliance of love had tinged that life, and the hopes had grown more glorious still. Its pathos lies in the love which seemed to die with fruition, in the hope which was cut off, in the youth which was cut short, and to us reading it surely there springs to our lips this question—Could not the Power which is greater than ours, and the love which we profess to be a nobler and a purer love than our own, have reached forth its strength and caused "that even this man should not have died?"

My brethren, let me ask you briefly to consider the significance of this question. The sentiment of it is excellent, but I think the argument of it is not solid. You must learn to separate—surely we are often obliged to do so in the history of life—between the argument which sentiment implies and the sentiment itself. As a rule, the general sentiments of human kind on great occasions are sentiments which ought to pass unchallenged, but as a rule the arguments, which we are tempted to base upon the sentiment are in themselves only misleading. The sentiment is excellent, for it is the sentiment of pity for those who suffered such an irreparable loss. The sentiment is excellent, for it is compassion and sympathy with those who are sorrowing. It is the longing that they could take the dead man and give him life again, and place him back in the bosom of those to whom he was dear. It is the desire of the human soul to see that every heart that can love and suffer shall have the full enjoyment of the object it loves. The sentiment is good, but is the argument sound? Think what argument underlies this, "Could not this man that opened the eyes of the blind have caused that even this man should not have died?" If He had the power why did He not use it; or, to put it in another form, is there not a suggestion of hardness and indifference that, possessing the power, it should not be used in this instance?

Now, surely, if we allow ourselves to reflect, that argument is not in itself sound. Is it true that it is a sign of a higher nature that because it possesses a power, therefore that power is inevitably to be used under any and all circumstances? Is the argument fair that, because circumstances seem to us to demand the use of the power that therefore it shall be employed? Consider what the experience of life teaches us. It teaches us more and more that it is far more likely to be a sign of a higher nature when power is not used than when it is. Inexperienced youth is urgent that power should be used, like the child with a new toy that has some mechanism in it will, the moment it receives the toy set the mechanism to work in order to see the force employed. Men only use mechanical power for the purpose for which it was invented. Inexperience likes to see the manifestation of power; manhood and experience knows that power is to be used with judgment and reflection. There are often cases in which there is the refusal to use means which urgency and sorrow and eagerness are

constantly pleading should be used. Can you conceive a more difficult position than this, that a man's fellow-men should be jeopardised and in peril—either the men imprisoned in the coal mine or fellow-creatures wrecked upon the coast, or those whose lives are in jeopardy from the flames—that knowledge and experience stand by, and close at hand are those widows and relatives pleading, "Do something, act, you have power, use it." But experience and knowledge are often and often obliged to say—We dare not, though these means are at our command, now, we dare not use them; to use them now is to use them too soon. You must wait till the fire-damp has escaped from the mine, when action will be possible; you must wait till the ship has come within range when we may fling our rockets on board and send a rope and throw them the means of salvation; we must wait till the fire has spent itself until we can deal with it; the only chance is to allow it to burn itself out. Knowledge and experience are constantly compelled to resist the urgency and the importunities of ignorance, and it is precisely because they possess that knowledge that men decline at that moment to use their power. When we were young, what were our dreams? How ready we were to soar away! How ready to place ourselves in this position or in that! If we were king how much we would do; if we were members of Parliament how much legislative reform we would enact; if we were judges how wonderfully we should deal with questions of law and administration; if we held a high ecclesiastical position what reforms would we not immediately commence. But the very moment men enter into the possession of responsibility they begin to discover that one of the duties of responsibility is to abstain from the use of power. That power given is given into the hand not merely of ignorance and impetuosity, but into the hand of experience. Moreover, the moment life grows upon us we begin to see that it is not one single thread that you can touch, but that life is a complicated and interlaced web, and the touching of one thread means the derangement of others. Then you begin to understand that you are in the midst of a great woven organism, which is in such close and direct relationship, one part with the other, that your action, which, when you only looked at it from a limited point of view seemed obvious and necessary, becomes now so dangerous that you dare not undertake the responsibility of it. Moreover, you begin to discover that the action of authorship and the action of power are not the wholly beneficial things, that there is a nobler way; that the power of moral suasion, that the power of influence, that the power of argument, that the power of example—these, not the arbitrary use of power, are the methods by which the best modes of reform are achieved. Ah! who knows how often men have to stand by and say, "I could do this, I dare not do it; to do it would be to exercise power, but to do it would be to postpone the very good I have at heart, and to lose the chance of the inauguration of that era of which, God send, I may not die without seeing the dawn."

Or, put it another way. We observe that this knowledge on the one side and experience on the other are constantly teaching us it is not wise to use power always because we have it. So also purest affection early learns the lesson. What is the difference between you and the parent of the child? You may win the child's heart with foolish prattle, you may win the child's heart with the gift of some of those little sweetmeats and toys and trifles, but the parent cannot always do it. The parent holds the higher sense of responsibility, and is often compelled to say, "What I would do, that I dare not do." Why? Because, if the parent's love is pure and lofty, it has a far higher regard than merely winning the transient affection of the child by the gratifying of its passing desire. That may bring about momentary and spasmodic affection, but that is not the "do all" and "end all" of life. Responsibility means the education, the moral improvement, the spiritual development of the child, and the very gratification of the child's wish may be for it a most dangerous thing. Surely, if love is given for trial, then it is over and over again a trial; necessary self-restraint, the trial of being compelled to abstain from giving the thing which the heart longs to give, because it looks and sees the child-life ripening into its manhood: it sees fiery passions which would awake in manhood; it sees the necessity of curbing those passions in early days; it sees how passion, restrained to-day, may be for good to-morrow; but passion, indulged to-day, may mean the disastrous flame which burns up all the best and noblest intentions of to-morrow. I say the experience of love, the experience of life, and the knowledge of force teach us constantly that it is not a sign of the highest nature to use power because one possesses it. May we not say that is true also with regard to the operation of things in the Divine order?

In arguing from the analogy of life I am only raising a presumption of a correspondence between the facts which we know and those which are largely hidden from us. The Divine purposes are not fully known, we have not had disclosed fully the meaning and intention of God in all His actions; but, surely, if He has placed us in a world in which one of the most patent facts is this—that love may often desire to act; eagerness, sorrow, and sympathy may wish to act; and yet knowledge, experience, judgment, and the higher laws of affection may restrain us from action—is it too much to say also that in the great order of God there may be reasons why the Almighty power should withhold His hand, an Almighty love should impose loving and restraining hands upon His action? We can almost trace

it every day, because precisely in the moment when we are the most eager to ask this question—Could not this have been spared, could not this blow have been averted, could not Divine power have put forth its strength to spare us from this sorrow?—at the very hour we are gaining something.

What hours are they in which those impressions are deepest, and what influences spring from them? We are in the presence of a great sorrow. The hand of death is around us, the sign and presence of the destroyer is in our midst; but what, we ask, are these feelings stirred in men's minds? Death is very near, we know not where it may lay its finger next. We watch, and we see one after another of the stately and conspicuous forms which belong to our country drop away. We see not merely the touch of death upon the Royal household, we see also the removal of an eminent ecclesiastical figure, strong, capable, carrying sympathy in his hand towards those who were struggling in the hour of their necessity, showing a deep social interest in the affairs and well-being of the people. We see lives like these pass away, and we see also behind it all the shadowy wings of death. As we sit in the hours of uncertainty which belong to such epochs as that, do we not see that the sentiment of human brotherhood becomes intensified? What is the moment in which you are drawn closest to your brother. Is it not the moment of common trial and common sorrow? Then your hand, grasping your brother's hand, lingers longer than it was wont to do; then you look askance to watch his retreating figure with the thought, perchance, oh! perchance, the shadows may fall 'ere we meet again. These are the moments in which we begin to value one another the more. Look how often with the lighter days of prosperity there is an asperity of disposition which thrusts brother from brother, and we, because all things go well with us, have joy in our breast, and hope in our heart, and we think not of what will be. Then at last comes the shadow and the sorrow, and we begin to feel that the touch of a brother's hand, and the sight of a brother's face, is more than we dreamed of before. We are dearer to one another, we are more precious to one another now, and at night we feel that the embrace and the "good night" is sweeter and tenderer than before. What is it? Human hearts are touched, impelled into new consciousness of their own affection, alive to the preciousness of the heritage and dowry of life that God has given into their hands.

Is it surprising that brotherhood should be intensified in hours of sorrow and uncertainty? Surely in times like this the seriousness of life presses upon us. I do not speak, far be it from me, for it has not been my wont to speak, of signs of the times; every age has its characteristics, but we will all agree that there is, somehow or another—as there must be in ages which have been ages of great prosperity—increasing luxury, increasing inventions and manœuvrings for the rendering more easy and pleasant the course of life. In times like these there is a temptation for us to believe that the world and life is for the accumulation of more abundance, or the acquisition of new amusements. Is it not something that you should stand at times in the presence of a power greater than your own; that there should break out amongst you a mysterious and inscrutable disease that seems to hold science and human knowledge at arm's length, and to defy the inquisition of those best capable of making it? Is there not something in such hours as this to press upon us the thought of the greater seriousness of life? If we could only realise that life is not simply what we once imagined it to be; "Let me live and let me so work that I shall gain a competency; the opportunity of being able to win pleasure and amusement, and pass the closing years of my life in indolence and ease."

Is it untrue to say that in English life the accumulation of wealth and the compassing of amusement have been more in that life than they ought to be? Have we always been alive to the large and serious aspects of life? That it is a time given us—short, indeed, but a time in which we may achieve something, and that the only thing worth achievement is to try and make human lives purer, happier, and better for our existence. The very presence of prosperity, the presence of pleasure and ease, and the absence of danger, immunity from suffering, immunity from disease would make us believe that at last science had risen up and by her charmed embrace had sheltered us from all the possible contingencies of life. But if that dream be swept away, and we are compelled to stand face to face with the eternal aspects of life as they are, to feel that for the moment desire and passion and pleasure had veiled and shrouded the eyes, and they had not perceived things as they ought to do; then to be compelled to look on things as they are and to realise the shortness of life is to realise the preciousness of life—that is, to realise the seriousness of life, and to realise the seriousness of life is to realise God in your life, and that you may look upon it as a priceless thing which God gives. The thought of the seriousness of life lands us in the thought, which is always so sublime and yet so easily put from us, that in the world there are hands that fold up as a vesture all the things which look most secure; heaven and earth pass away; but you and I may stand face to face with Him whose years are the unchanging years, and may recognise that God alone is great. These things are worth the learning, and from them I argue that it would not be always wise for the Almighty just to interpose because the most earnest and the most worthy sentiment in the world, and the most pathetic situations in life pleaded for the intervention of His power.

Once more, let me ask you to notice that,

though the argument appears not to be solid, there is always given—and this is what Christ teaches in the incident before us—the illumination which lies behind it. Christ teaches in this incident that it is wise and well to hold His hand. When He knew that Lazarus was sick, He abode where He was. This inaction of Christ was deliberate inaction. He did it on purpose; He did it because He had a purpose in view. And what advantages flowed from His inaction? The people, as I have said, were touched with the emotions of sorrow and the emotions of sympathy, and though these may pass away like a fleeting cloud, leaving us harder of heart than before, yet they are sweet angel visitors if we yield to them, they will give us softness, tenderness, and consciousness which did not exist before; they deepen the sense of love and affection; and when Christ held communion with these sisters at Bethany, and spoke of Himself, of life and death, of the dead brother that should rise again, was it not an utterance which was all the sweeter to them because they stood in the midst of that moment which is the moment of Heaven's silence and earth's sorrow. But He did it because He will never disappoint the underlying and worthy sentiment which gives rise to the question. I said the sentiment was noble. It is the desire to see the heart satisfied, it is the desire to remove sorrow; "Could not this have been spared?" To which comes the answer of Christ, and it was a nobler answer than the sentiment demanded. For two things came out of Christ's action. They wished for a manifestation of power. Could He not have stayed by the sick bed of the man and have arrested the sickness and caused the fever to pass away? But He did more than that. He watched till death had laid his hands upon him, and the power He displayed was not the power of banishing sickness, but of quickening the dead. "Lazarus come forth." Why! there is a greater manifestation of power. Those who had scepticism about Christ's power said, "Could He not have done this if he cured the blind." There is irony and unbelief in the question; but, behold! the answer by a greater Power —vanquished life restored is more than sickness abated. But it was not merely power He showed! He gave more than they asked in the manifestation of love, and in the message concerning the permanence and the enduring character of the ties of human life. Suppose, for a moment, He had yielded to the soft sentiment of the hour, and had abated the sickness of Lazarus, and restored him hale and strong to his sisters' arms, still He would not have warded off the pang and agony of the final separation. The restoration to health is not the final averting of the presence of death. They must have known full well that though for that once death had been driven from their doors, that death, inexorable death, would come and stand before their threshold in the future. But now that Christ has wrestled with death, now that He stood not by the sick man's bed, but by the dead man's sepulchre, now that He has raised him out of the embrace of the grave, now that He has raised their brother again, there is the message to them, and through them to all of us, that death is not so strong as the ties which bind men's hearts together. They know from that hour that though death might come and break up the little household, they had seen their brother emerge from the grasp of death, they had known the power of Him who is "the Resurrection and the Life," and therefore for them death has been robbed of half its terrors. Was not that a deeper and a stronger message to the craving of the human heart, and the sense of the dearness of the ties of blood and relationship, than anything which would have come from the passing abatement of the sickness? There was the answer of love, and the answer of the greater love—the family tie is stronger than the tie of death, the power of love is greater than the power of the grave. Henceforth whatever shadows came between Mary and Martha and her brother, there is no shadow which is stronger than death, the shadow of death has been broken by the power of life and love. So that the message was a message to the sentiment of humanity, it was a message that the sentiment was right in itself. The desire of the sentiment was this. If God the Almighty created human hearts, and human love capable of such intensity of attachment capable of such solicitude and tenderness, capable of such capacity for aching when the tie is broken, and the life links are snapped, if God has created men with such capacity of love, has he created them that these links may be snapped, these affections bruised, these hearts broken, and the hearts which binds us together torn rudely asunder. The answer is He has not made you so. That which desires restoration of affection is a natural and true desire, it is a real sentiment, it is an ennobling and a heaven-born sentiment. Natural love is God's gift to us, and He will not gainsay that gift nor mar its tenderness, nor leave us without the heart's desire, though He bids us look into the open grave. That is what Christ taught. Sentiment is based upon a noble instinct, but the argument, that therefore then and there He should do this or that, is wrong. You may trust God, then in all cases where your heart's pure love goes forth to Him, but you must not trust to the imagination, or the arguments which your imagination may lead you to base upon any sentiment of humanity. But I know what will be said, you are arguing against the sentiment, or trying to remove the sentiment by the pressure of argument. I do not think so. I am arguing this question because I want one sentiment to be replaced by another. I want sentimentalism to be replaced by the sentiment of faith. You cannot argue away human sentiment, it is the vainest thing to try to do. You understand but little of humanity if you do not know that the

argument of the heart will always outweigh the argument of the head. But you may use understanding and judgment to instruct and develop sentiment, and let faith replace the presence of mere sentimental desire. That is what Christ does. What is faith? Faith, well, you will say it is the evidence of things not seen. I will say to you, faith is the enlargement of the intellect and imagination. Because why is it that we are sometimes tempted to say, "Could he not have done this?" Because our sentiment is good, now we should like to see all sorrow alleviated. But the argument is false that He should thus and in that way ever remove sorrow. Let our imagination enlarge under the guidance and inspiration of faith, and we shall see that when God holds His hand it is for wisdom and love's sake; He does it because He has in His other hand an ampler answer to the desire of our hearts than ever our poor stunted imagination could conceive. "O, rest in the Lord," is the cry which now may come to human hearts, and, like the touch of a loving hand, soothes the weariness which comes when sorrow has benumbed our hearts. But the sacred singer knew that although he said "O, rest in the Lord," he was bound to say that other thing, "He will give thee thy heart's desire." "Thy heart's desire," not the poor foolish forms in which our narrow imagination, or our selfish thoughts have clothed them; "our heart's desires," not in the fashion and method in which our shortsightedness would like to see them return; but He will give us "our heart's desires" in a nobler way, in a larger form, in a brighter and happier world. There is no single desire of your heart, no desire which nobler ambition has sometimes created within your soul, no desire which tender love has awakened within your heart, no desire which the sense of pathetic failure may have created within your bosom, but will be answered by the Almighty love and power of God. But until then you must abide in the hour of the silences. It has been said human life is a cry between the silences—the silence of eternity which was, and the silence of eternity to which we go; life is but a wail and a cry, and a sigh, here to-day, gone to-morrow. Pardon me, I would not call it such. It is not the cry between the silences, it is not the flitting of the bird between the warmly lighted hall and the darkness, life is silence between the voices of God; between the glad voice which sounded round the birth of man, and it is silence which goes when the ears of our hearing shall be unstopped, and we shall hear the music and the melody of heaven. We live now in the silence, and we must "wait upon the Lord." We live in the silence, and we must "rest in Him." You must replace the sentiment of your impatience by the sentiment of your faith, because after all is said and done this remains true, that God alone is great, and in your life and mine it is well that there should be hours in which we are compelled to stand face to face with Him, and know that He alone can stay, and He alone can bless. And all you have in the past will be instinct with the power of suggestion in the future. Christ's life is that illumination. Christ pleaded, "If it be Thy will let this cup pass from me." But in the withholding of the answer to that prayer came the redemption of the world. The Apostle cried, "Let this thorn be taken from me." The answer was, "My grace is sufficient for thee." Better far to live with the thorn than to be without the grace of God. Better to drink the cup, if the cup be the salvation of others through your discipline and sorrow as your Master drank it before you, than that without the cup of God's salvation you should pass through the world. Better you should take up life as He sends it to you, better in the overshadowing hours you should learn to trust, that in the darkened hours of sorrow you should learn to trust, better in the hours when mind and soul are perplexed and bewildered you should still trust to God's larger hope. For believe it to be true that "this man who opened the eyes of the blind," this man who raised the dead to life again, this is He who is set over the light, and life and happiness of human kind; His love is unerring, His tenderness unchanging, and His power advances towards the end of time, and at last His voice will speak, it will not tarry, and the silences will be broken, and God will give us our heart's desire, not perhaps to-day, not as our shortsighted wisdom has imagined, but in some other world and in some far better way.

SACRIFICE.

By the Rev. R. S. HASSARD, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Dalston, N.E., and Lecturer at St. Antholin's Church, City.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, March 13th, 1892.

"Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν)."—St. Matthew xx. 28.

DURING these first weeks in Lent, we generally think of sin and penitence and discipline; but to-night I ask you to come to the hill of Calvary, and gaze upon the life laid down, "a ransom in the stead of many"; and I do so because, as a well-known Scotch preacher has said, "It is on the summit of Calvary that you command the grandest views of Sinai." Yes, it is as you gaze upon the Crucified that you learn what and how horrid a thing sin is! It is as you stand awe-struck at Calvary that the Holy Spirit lights up the flame of penitence, kindles the furnace of self-discipline and sacrifice.

1. "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

Our text is a very storehouse of teachings on the subject of the sacrifice of Christ.

(*a.*) Just one word as to the first truth which it contains. "The Son of Man came to minister . . . to give His life." Here is a reminder (and by no means an unnecessary reminder) that we are to recognise His sacrifice as begun in the heavens when "being in the form of God, He emptied Himself, took unto Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men"; as continued in that whole life of utter self-surrender and obedience; as reaching its climax, its fulfilment, in the drinking of the cup, the cup of death upon the Cross—"He gave His life a ransom in the stead of many."

(*b.*) The next truth which I would bring up to the surface is of infinite importance.

We all know how faith droops its head and withers when a suspicion arises that its object is a sham! Lest we should believe, as many have done, that the sufferings of our Saviour were unreal, our attention is directly drawn to the perfect human nature of the sufferer. It is the "Son of Man" who came to give His life a ransom.

Many of you know how the minds of great theologians of the present time are full of the question, "What limitations could and did the Son of God impose upon Himself that He might take the nature of man in all its fulness and perfection"—upon that subject I will not enter.

But that we may be quite sure that the "Son of Man" did truly and really suffer, let us glance for a moment at some of those striking little "pictures of suffering,' which seem to drop quite undesignedly now from one evangelist, now from another, as they tell of the time when the last great act is drawing nigh.

Look at this picture. Our blessed Lord has been making a true Lenten retreat at the little village of Ephraim, in the country near to the wilderness of Judæa. About a week before the Passover He steadfastly sets his face to go up to Jerusalem. Now comes the little picture of suffering, sketched in a dozen words by St. Mark alone: "As they were on the way, Jesus went before them, and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid!" What a scene rises up at once before our eyes! The Master in such mental strain that He must be alone; He walks fast ahead of His little company; they are amazed at His silence and His action; they see His frame convulsed with agony; they hear His broken prayer; they are afraid.

Presently He is able to speak to them again. Then He tells them the cause of His agony, declares that the end of His journey to Jerusalem shall be His betrayal and His death.

Again, let us glance at that scene recorded by St. John alone, probably occurring on the Monday in Holy week. Two of His disciples tell Him that some Greeks, proselytes, desire to see Him. Mark well the strange sequel to this natural announcement; this token of a world waiting to be saved, calls up before His vision all the suffering which He must bear. With quivering frame and broken voice He cries, "The hour is come! except a corn of wheat fall into the ground, and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. Now is my soul troubled! What shall I say? Father, save me from this hour. (No! for that I will not pray), for this cause came I unto this hour. Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the Prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

What need we further witness as to the reality of His suffering. Do we need St. Luke's addition to the story of the agony in the garden, "His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground," or, above all, need we the great central word upon the Cross, uttered with loud voice and breaking heart, "My God! My God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

Yes, the "Son of Man" did suffer in all reality.

2. But now we pause, and ask how is it that He suffered so much? Other men had endured the pains of a lingering, torturing death by crucifixion, almost without a murmur; and in these days many of us have seen men, who had lived utterly godless, careless lives, meet the pains of death without a cry. How is it that He, one who all His life through had shown no trace of cowardice, against whose moral life no enemy had ever been able to bring the smallest charge—how is it that He at the prospect of death was almost beside Himself.

Our text brings forth its central truth as an answer to this question, "The Son of Man came to give (up) His life a ransom for many."

(*a.*) "A Ransom" (λύτρον). The Jews were much more familiar than we are with the idea of ransom. The "Books of Moses" contain many very definite regulations about ransoms. Now, it is a payment made for the recovery of an inheritance, now for the freeing of a slave; now it is the sacrifice of a life, that the life of a man or beast may be redeemed and saved.

"The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many." When the Lord "came," man had forfeited his inheritance; he was a fettered slave; his very life was forfeit: "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

And does not our whole soul protest that if the "Son of Man" would so win back the inheritance, so set free the captive, so give His life for the life of men, that with clear conscience man might believe in his redemption (and this we know is where the sacrifices of the Old Testament had failed, they could not satisfy the conscience which longed for pardon!)—does not our whole soul, I say, demand that such a Saviour must not be separate from sinners, but must bear upon His head the full weight of their loss and slavery and shame.

It was this great burden which so bowed down the "Son of Man" when He approached the final act, when "He gave (up) His life a ransom for many."

Let us try and conceive something of what that burden must have been.

To use the expression of the writer of the Book of Wisdom, "man had been calling to himself the poison of destruction and the kingdom of death"—man had by his separation from the higher power been setting in motion forces which must eventually destroy him, crush him out of existence, unless a new power be brought to the earth. These are some of the forces which he had set in motion to his own undoing; shame and fear, and pain and death; the power and mastery of the Prince of this world; and the sense of the righteous wrath, shutting out like a cloud the light of the Love of God.

This was the burden the Saviour must bear if He would ransom men.

Thus weighted He fought the battle, suffered the bruising of His heel, that He might bruise the Serpent's head.

Thus weighted, by the power of His own sinless life He burst asunder the great overhanging cloud, carried up mankind in Himself to the glorious throne, to the welcoming arms, of the one eternal Father.

"We may not know, we cannot tell
What pains He had to bear,
But we believe it was for us
He hung and suffered there.

"There was no other good enough
To pay the price of sin,
He only could unlock the gate
Of heaven, and let us in."

(*b.*) But, we naturally ask, for whom was the ransom paid? Our text answers "for many" (ἀντὶ πολλῶν), St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans (chap. v.) will not leave us in any doubt as to the meaning of those words. He shows that "the many" here is by way of contrast to "the one"—in other words, "He gave his life a ransom for all men."

The world indeed saw but one man crucified, but God saw in Him the whole human race; the "word made flesh," the "Son of Man."

But yet there is a truth involved in the word "many," instead of "all," for "all" will not accept redemption through the precious blood. Oh! may we be amongst those who by sacramental union, and true repentance, and earnest faith, and constant self-discipline, are indeed living members of Christ, ever striving "to know the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, and to be made conformable unto His death.

"Saviour, beneath that Cross,
In helplessness I cling,
Trusting no more to arm of flesh, but now
Be Thou my King.

O keep me close to Thee,
When the quick shifting throng
Of earthly cares oppress my heart and brain;
For thou art strong.

Be with me when I faint
Beneath my weight of woe;
For Thou the secret mysteries of grief,
Alone dost know."

3. And yet once more let us turn to our text—let us glance at those two little words with which it began, "Even as." "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." Those words tell us that on the particular occasion to which our text refers, our blessed Lord was not so much holding up the picture of His great sacrifice to win our love and devotion, but that He might call upon His disciples, each in his measure, to imitate His sacrifice.

Why is it that Christianity makes such slow advance in its great task of winning all nations of the earth? Is it not because we Christians think chiefly of our own salvation? It may be that we fall not far short in the matters of penitence, self-discipline and prayer; but do we appreciate at their right value, and in their right relation to ourselves as Christians, the souls and the bodies of all the world about us? Nay, is it not true that sometimes the man who makes no profession of Christianity surpasses us in the love of humanity, and in sacrifice for the welfare of his fellow-men.

Surely we have grasped little the true meaning of Christ's religion if we see not that it was intended to make us more manly and more brotherly, as well as humble and faithful and self-controlled.

It is wonderful how the world seems to bow its head in honour of self-sacrifice! Put it down to sentiment or what you will, but there can be no doubt that there have been few men in these last few years who have so commended Christianity to the English race as the self-forgetful General Gordon, and Father Damien, the brother to the lepers.

Yes, there is something in the conscience of all but the most hardened men, which recognises God-likeness in any act of undoubted sacrifice of self. See how our countrymen were moved ten years ago by the news of that Captain Strachan, who, when his vessel was driven ashore on the coast of Carnarvonshire, and all the crew had left the ship, he alone remaining behind with the one life-belt reserved for himself, caught sight of a poor shivering stowaway, whom terror had driven forth from his hiding-place. No time now for anger or blame, but taking the belt intended for himself, he fastened it securely to the lad and told him to leap into the sea. He followed himself, but without a life-buoy. The lad alone escaped to tell the tale.

Or, again, some may remember when the roof of a well-known church was under repair, two boys from the adjoining Grammar School went into the

church. The workmen absent, they climbed the ladders, got on the scaffolding, and had a scamper among the rafters. At length a plank gave way; in falling, the younger of the boys managed to lay hold of a beam, while the elder saved himself by catching the younger by the legs. There they hung, hoping for the return of the workmen. After a time the elder perceived the hold of the younger relaxing. He asked the little lad whether he could hold on a while if freed from his weight. "Yes, I think so." So bidding him give a message to his mother, he said "Good-bye," and loosed his hold. A dull thud on the floor and all was over. Shortly the workmen returned and rescued the younger lad. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend."

And, dear brethren in Christ, our blessed Lord calls each one of us to recognise that sacrifice in some form or other, true Christian manliness, is an essential part of our religion. It is quite true that but few are called to what the world styles "heroic deeds," as Mr. Keble says:—

> "If on our daily course our mind
> Be set to hallow all we find,
> New treasures still, of countless price,
> God will provide for sacrifice.
>
> "The trivial round, the common task,
> Will furnish all we need to ask;
> Room to deny ourselves, a road
> To bring us daily nearer God."

But, while we pitch not our strain too high, let us be sure we do not strike too low a note—see to it that self-saving is not the prevailing aspect of our religion, but "the service of man," "even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." It is the most hopeful sign with regard to our dear Church of England that there is at the present time the offering of so much self-sacrificing service by men and women, by priests and people. Let us thank God for this; but let us be careful, on the one hand, that our revived worship of God in the beauty of holiness falls not short of its true purpose the increasing love of the brethren; and, on the other hand, let us be careful, that our zeal for social welfare be never allowed to quench the flame which gave it birth.

Let us strive that all our life of worship and of work may be lived in the spirit of that hymn, made more dear to us by the exquisite music to which it has been set:—

> "Oh dearly, dearly has He loved,
> And we must love Him too,
> And trust in His redeeming blood,
> And try His works to do."

Amen.

THE Bishop of Wakefield will preside at the fourteenth annual meeting of the Funeral Reform Association in the Church House, Westminster, on Monday, June 20th, at 3.30 p.m.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 26, 1892.

THE MICE IN COUNCIL.

NO doubt the noble and distinguished members of the English Church Union have the welfare of the Church at heart; it is a pity then that they cannot set about ensuring it in ways a little more practical. Here we have them all meeting in council last Tuesday, and nothing will satisfy them but the repeal of the Public Worship Regulation Acts right away down to 1840. We are almost inclined to regret that they stopped there—indeed, they can hardly be said to have, for we find that one member, in a learned speech which began with the fourth century and ended with the sixteenth, stuck out for the whole hog, explained that the repeal of the Acts above mentioned was a "first step," and declared that they would not stop till the Church of England was free, and had its own laws entire and its liberties uninfringed. The English Church Union, we take it, intend then to go for the Constitutions of Clarendon as well as the Public Worship Regulation Acts and everything between.

Of course it is all about the Discipline Bill now before the House of Commons. We don't pretend to be in love with the aforesaid Bill, but we cannot see what all the fuss is about. After all, there are "criminous clerks," and we presume that even the English Church Union would like to get rid of them; we would not for the world suggest otherwise. But at present it is so hard to get rid of them, that in nine cases out of ten it is not done at all. Any Bill which makes the cleansing process easier ought to be welcomed by everybody except the Liberationists, who have accordingly blocked this particular Bill more than once already for their own purposes. Are they in agreement with the English Church Union, we wonder?

Doubtless such little harmless provisos as tender conscienced ecclesiastics may desire will eventually find a place in the Bill before it becomes law; and we certainly see no signs of the haste with which Sir Walter Phillimore says it is being pressed upon a "reluctant" episcopate. We make bold to doubt, by the way, whether an episcopate which is open to a fine of anything up to a thousand pounds for trying to get rid of a rascal, is really so reluctant to be relieved of the impost. In any case this vapouring is mischievous. What does the English Church Union mean by the Church "having its own laws"? The phrase either means a great deal too much, or nothing, unless it is taken in its plain English, which means no more than that the Church, by means of its constituted officials, shall administer its services, ceremonies, etc., according to the law of the land which has established it. That law has got to be supreme, anyhow. As to the "statement" that the exercise of "spiritual" jurisdiction granted to the Apostles was now vested in the bishops, it is mere rubbish. The "spiritual" jurisdiction wielded by the bishops is granted them by Parliament, endorsed by the courts of justice, and, if necessary, backed up by the policeman—there is nothing apostolic about it. This brings us to the resolution passed at this meeting of wise men, pledging them to resist any measure which professes to confer spiritual powers by authority of Parliament. What are "spiritual" powers? They don't appear to know. Personal religious influence, the power to convince the world of righteousness, of sin, and of judgment are spiritual powers, and certainly no Parliament can give them or take them away. But the discipline of criminous clerks, locking up a drunkard, expelling a wanton, or making a bankrupt pay his debts—these, we apprehend, are affairs of administration, they require a magistrate and a police-station, or at least a bailiff; they are carried out by persons armed with lawful powers, of whom the chief are the bishops. Such powers can only come from Parliament. No one imagines that "authority" of Parliament can confer the power to convert a sinner; on the other hand, it is no use applying for a "spiritual" warrant to apprehend a thief.

THE Bishop of Bedford will preside at the fourth monthly meeting at the Church House, on Thursday, April 7th, at 4 p.m. The Bishop of Liverpool has ssubcribed £1 1s. to the funds of the Society.

CANON C. W. BARDSLEY, vicar of Ulverston, has issued a circular to the clergy of the Carlisle diocese declining to offer himself at the next election of a Proctor in Convocation, on the ground of "ill-health and partial blindness."

THE Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has appointed Bishop Marsden as Assistant-Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, his lordship finding that the increasing number of confirmations necessitates some help. Dr. Marsden was Bishop of Bathurst from 1869 to 1885.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE TIMES OF THE FIRST FIFTY DAYS AND EVENTS OF OUR LORD'S LIFE.

1st—25th Dec.	Jesus Christ is born.
2nd—26th Dec.	The visit of the shepherds.
8th—1st Jan.	The Circumcision.
40th—2nd Feb.	1st. The visit of the Magi to Jerusalem, A.M. 2nd. Of the Virgin and Child later and return to Bethlehem. 3rd. P.M. of the Magi to Bethlehem and departure to their own homes at sunset. At midnight, Joseph warned.
41st—3rd Feb.	Flight into Egypt.
42nd—4th Feb.	Massacre of the Innocents.
50th	Egypt.

Since almost all dates are doubtful, it is too late, after 1890 years of use, to unsettle, and not worth while, if it could be done, the events celebrated being the point, and not the dates.

In attempting then to draw out a new table of the first 50 days of our Lord's life, I think I may be able to call attention to certain points which are full of interest. Our Lord Jesus Christ is born on the 25th December in a stable.

On the night of the 25th, shepherds watching their flocks by night, are told of the birth of the Saviour of mankind, and early on the morning of the 26th the shepherds come to find the angelic message true. Finding it to be so, they proclaim the glad tidings at Jerusalem. And here is a wonderful thing, we do not read of anybody believing them or going to see the Child. The shepherds must have been laughed at. A King's Son to be born in a stable! The very place would prove the absurdity of the announcement. Still it may have been talked about, and been a nine days' wonder, and so, to wondering and religious minds, some impression would be made.

The priests of the Temple would naturally foster these impressions, because they were in accordance with prophecy. Even Suetonius and others had stated that about this time a Deliverer should come, and the world was in expectation. But should He be born in a stable? The idea was ridiculous.

On the 27th the people would be leaving Bethlehem after transacting their business and paying their taxes. They, anxious to return home, could not be troubled about a Child born in a stable, and still less be expected to believe that Child was the Saviour of mankind. Therefore the emptying village gave an opportunity to Joseph to find a house for the Virgin and Child, where they stayed in quiet solitude till the time of her purification.

On the 1st January the Child is circumcised, and the quiet time continues till the 40th day, the 2nd February, which is crowded with events.

We now come to the Magi, to whom in distant lands had been revealed that Christ was born, and a special guide was provided by the star going before them. Artists are not always too accurate, *e.g.*, they often represent the Magi as present with the shepherds finding the Child in the stable. Now the shepherds, being Jews, might be permitted to come into the presence of the Virgin, though, being veiled, she would be unseen by them. But the Magi, being Gentiles, would not be allowed to come into her presence till after her purification. Then, again, the artist

generally represents these men as solitaries, riding on camels, whereas, for their long and dangerous journey they would require guards and attendants, a baggage train and camp followers, so that all would form a striking and imposing cavalcade, yet not numerous enough to frighten as an aggressive body. As they marched along they would inquire where the city was to which they were being guided, and after a long time, on the 39th day of our Lord's life, they arrived on the summit of one of the ridges of the hills surrounding Jerusalem, and they saw the star over-hanging Jerusalem and Bethlehem. They knew Jerusalem was the city of a grea king, and were near their journey's end. So they halted, for they were not sufficiently near to be able to enter the city that night, for the gates would be shut, and, besides, they would wish to rest and prepare for the morrow. They would clean their travel-stained dresses and harness, and they would get their presents ready, and with the pleasure of their accomplishing their journey to-morrow they would rest comfortably. But what was their amazement when they rose on the morning of the 40th day? There was no star to be seen! Yet what matter, Jerusalem the city of the king was in sight, they would have no further difficulty.

Early on the morning of the 40th Joseph, with the Virgin, had started on their way to present the Child at the Court of His Father, and, as when the Queen leaves Windsor the royal standard is lowered, so the Royal Child, having left his home, the star is withdrawn till He should return. Before Jesus could hold a Court of his own He must be presented in His Father's Temple.

The Magi and their followers overtake Joseph and the Virgin. There is no notice taken of them ; they are but poor travellers. The Magi rapidly pass by them and hurry to the city, and on to the palace of Herod. As in after years, so now, the whole city was moved. Who are these Easterns? whence do they come? what is the object of their visit? And then it is rumoured they have come to visit a Child, born king of the Jews. Then the mysterious sayings of the shepherds are called to mind. Herod, without betraying his fears, sends for the priests and elders from the Temple, and they and all people hurry to the space in front of the palace to see the mysterious visitors. And thus it came to pass, when Joseph, Mary, and the Child came to the Temple, "the King came to His own, and His own received Him not"—only Simeon, for Anna came in afterwards. Then, having fulfilled all the requirements of the law, Joseph and Mary return to the home at Bethlehem, and when the King enters the house the star, the standard, reappears.

Herod having made all the necessary inquiries orders the Magi to go to Bethlehem and to search diligently for the young Child, that when they have found Him, he may also come and worship Him. And here is a strange point. Why did not Herod himself accompany them, or at least send his guards to assist in the search? Equally strange that no curious desire seized any of the Jews to join in their search for their King. The Wise Men depart, and as soon as they are outside the walls of Jerusalem they again see with exceeding joy the star over Bethlehem; they hasten on, and, in the evening of the 40th day, make their presentations, and after doing this it would be too late to return to the city, it would not be reached before dark ; but being warned of God they return home by another way. All this added to the mystery about the Child. Did they find Him? Why, on the 41st day, have they not returned to tell? It could not have been the true child, otherwise the Magi would have been glad to come and tell Herod. But we know the reason why they did not.

Simeon had uttered a prophecy which received its immediate fulfilment. The Light of the Gentiles had come and was made known to the Wise Men. This prophecy is usually noticed as having its fulfilment in Cornelius.

On the night of the 40th day Joseph is warned. The offerings made by the Wise Men were very valuable, and thus Joseph was furnished with ample means for the instant flight that was to follow before the sun should rise on the 41st day, and on that day Joseph with the Virgin and Child were well on their way to Egypt before Herod sent to inquire why the Wise Men had not returned. Herod, finding himself mocked, probably sent out his orders for the massacre of the infants on the 42nd day, personifying in himself the prophecy of Mal. iii., the Epistle for the Purification, which threatens judgment upon all the sins of which he was guilty.

In Egypt on the 50th day.

C. J. WILDING.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FAITH AS A FACULTY.

SIR,—I have defined faith as the faculty which apprehends revealed truth. "Wisdom," said the Saviour, "is justified of her children."

To assert is not to prove ; so I must ask Mr. Hobson to show how I beg the question. Mr. Hobson's plan is not mine. I should rather have said, "Come let us pray earnestly for faith."

I do not mind Mr. Hobson's thinking that he has succeeded in using his superior intelligence to better effect ; but where is the modesty of saying so? May I venture slightly to hint that I do not think that he has had the problem, Faith is a Faculty, much in his mind at all ; he would not otherwise have written as he has done.

No, Mr. Lawrence, kindly excuse me, "Faith is not a state of being as much as love." Man believes, because of the faculty of faith being in exercise ; then he loves. The eye is a faculty, sight is the faculty in exercise. He sees—is in a state. At least, of seeing, this is my way of putting it. I think I should put it like this when it is a question of finding a *locale* for the faculty : The spirit of man is that *locale*, and the Spirit of God implants and develops it there. Its function is to apprehend the mysteries of the kingdom of God—all revealed truth. This is, as I take it, Pauline theology.

The Saviour's reasoning is not quite on all fours with Pascal's. A man believes God, then he submits his will. After this all is easy. There is a great deal more in this question than has as yet been brought out. I hope that not only our present correspondents, but others, will still further bring their minds to bear upon it.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, March 19th, 1892.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Archer, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Halifax; Rector of Stilton, Hunts.
Bayley, Rev. Charles James, M.A.; Vicar of Ambleside, Windermere.
Birch, Rev. G. T., Curate of Altringham; Rector of Bucknall-cum-Bagnall, Hanley.
Blake, Rev. A. H. W., M.A., Senior Curate of Eton; Chaplain to Kensington Workhouse and Infirmary.
Bromby, Rev. H. B., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Bethnal-green, and Rural Dean of Spitalfields; Vicar of All Saints', Clifton.
Carter, Rev. Thomas N., M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the diocese of Manchester.
Cooper, Rev. W. H. Hewlett, M.A., Vicar of Bradenstoke; Rector of Tockenham, Wilts,
Danks, Rev. W., M.A., Rector of Richmond, Yorkshire; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
Foster, Rev. Frederic La Trobe, M.A.; Vicar of Widcombe, Bath.
Grant, Rev. Canon Cyril, M.A., Vicar of Aylesford; Rural Dean of Cobham.
Hack, Rev. Edward John, Curate of Newton-in-Makerfield, Warrington; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Freckleton, Kirkham.
Hall, Rev. Martin J., B.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the diocese of Chester.
Hargrove, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Cambridge; Surrogate for the diocese of Ely.
Heath, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Wigtoft; Rural Dean of North Holland No. 1.
Hollins, Rev. W. T., M.A., Rector of St. Peter's, Bristol; Vicar of St. George's, Tufnell-park.
Horton, Rev. Reginald, M.A.; Rural Dean of North Forest, Gloucestershire.
Hunt, Rev. H. F., M.A., Rector of St. Andrew's, Brisbane; Rector of Allorra, Queensland.
Hutchinson, Rev. C. B., M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury; Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.
Jones, Rev. Edward Herbert, M.A., late Vicar of Rolvenden, Kent; Vicar of St. Phillip's, Battersea.
Keble, Rev. John Robert, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Acaster Malbis, York.
McKenzie, Rev. F., Curate-in-Charge of St. James's, Aston; Vicar of St. Basil's, Deritend, Birmingham.
Madge, Rev. Arthur Giles, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the diocese of Lincoln.
Masters, Rev. Prebendary J. H., M.A., Rector of Slinfold; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Sussex.
Morton, Rev. Henry, Rector of St. Stephen's, South Shields; Rector of Great Stainton, Durham.
Moxly, Rev. J. H. S., B.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class; Chaplain to the Forces, First Class.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bassett, Rev. R. E., for forty years Rector of the parish, at North Thoresby Rectory, on the 17th inst., aged 76.
Bee, Rev. Samuel Fry, at Jarrow Grange Rectory, on the 17th inst., aged 33.
Buckley, Rev. William Edward, M.A., Rector of the parish and Rural Dean, after a very short illness, at Middleton Cheney, Northamptonshire, on the 18th inst., aged 74.
Foster, Rev. John. M.A., J.P., forty-seven years Rector of Foxearth, at Foxearth Rectory, Essex, on the 18th inst., aged 77.
Gallwey, Rev. Thomas Gifford, M.A., R.N., late Vicar of Welford, at Belgrave, Leicester, on the 12th inst., aged 78.
Hadow, Rev. George, M.A., late Rector of Tiverton, at Tidcombe House, Tiverton, on the 20th inst., aged 74.
Harrison, Rev. William Dann, for fifty-seven years Rector of the parish, at South Stoneham Vicarage, on the 13th inst., aged 88.
Rowdon, Rev. Edward Charles Mortimer, S.T.B., Missionary under appointment in the diocese of Albany, late assistant priest, St. Clement's Church, Philadelphia, at Lyon Mountain Clinton Co., N.Y., aged 33.
Sharp, Rev. Canon Henry Isaac, at Downham Rectory, Ely, on the 16th inst.
Wale, Rev. Henry John, M.A., at Bedford Park, on the 14th inst., aged 64.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE HOLY COMMUNION: ITS NATURE AND DESIGN.

By the Rev. B. MATURIN, M.A., Vicar of Lymington and Rural Dean.

Sermon Preached in Lymington Church, Hants.

"This do in remembrance of Me."—Luke xxii. 19.

I WISH to call your attention, my Christian friends, to the consideration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the most solemn and sacred ordinance in the Christian Church, ordained by Christ Himself "as a means whereby we receive grace, and a pledge to assure us thereof." A golden thread running through the history of the Church of God, and cementing the members of the Church, from the first early days of pure Christianity to the present time, into one holy happy brotherhood of grace and faith and love. A blessed ordinance for the "strengthening and refreshing of the soul," wherein thousands and tens of thousands of weary pilgrims, all along the centuries of time, refreshed and animated by the presence of Christ and the grace of the Holy Spirit of God, have gone forth to run with renewed energy the race that is set before them, and "manfully to fight under the banner of Christ's Cross against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue His faithful soldiers and servants unto their life's end."

And how solemn the circumstances under which it was ordained on the very night in which He was betrayed! You are privileged to enter that upper chamber. The Lord is there and His disciples, and Judas the traitor. A solemn sadness seems to settle on the face of the blessed Redeemer; a feeling of deep solemnity pervades the little band of His disciples. "With desire," He says, "have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer"; and then He takes bread and blesses it. "This," He says, "is My body which is given for you"; likewise, also the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new testament of My blood which is shed for you"; and then He leaves them His parting legacy of love: "This do in remembrance of Me."

My friends, do you desire to meet the Lord in this blessed ordinance in obedience to His gracious invitation? Then permit me to set before you a few thoughts which, by the grace of God, may help you to come, and to come with profit to your soul.

There are indeed many persons who keep away from the table of the Lord because they have no *distinct views* of the nature and design of the ordinance itself. They feel, indeed, that it is a very solemn and a mysterious ordinance, but having no real or distinct views of its meaning, they absent themselves from the table of the Lord, and thus deprive their souls of the benefits to be received thereby. Let me, therefore, in few and simple words set before you—

I. The nature and design of this blessed ordinance. We have an account of its institution given us in three of the Gospels, in St. Matthew xxvi., Mark xiv., and Luke xxii., and from the words of the blessed Saviour Himself you will see that it was designed to be a *commemorative ordinance*—I mean an ordinance in remembrance of Christ Himself, and of His love in dying for you—"This do, He says, in remembrance of Me," and this is the first view of this holy ordinance that is set before you by the Church of England. In her Catechism, she asks, "Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?" and she answers, "For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby"; and, again, in her communion office she invites "all such as be religiously and devoutly disposed to partake of the most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ to be by them received in *remembrance* of His meritorious Cross and passion. And in the administration of the elements, the minister is instructed to address each communicant—"Take and eat this in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee," "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee." And this view of the subject is illustrated by looking back to the ordinance of the Passover, for what the Passover was to the Jew that the Lord's Supper is to the Christian, so that, indeed, the last Passover became the first supper of the Lord. The same table that was spread for the Passover became also the table of the Lord. "The Master saith, My time is at hand, I will keep the passover at thy house with My disciples;" and then we are told that as they did eat Jesus took bread and blessed it. Likewise after supper He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; this do, as often as ye shall drink it in *remembrance* of Me." How simple, yet how instructive the ordinance! How easy the application: "Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast." Here is the application by an inspired Apostle. The Passover was ordained by God Himself in remembrance of a great deliverance. How that the Lord passed over the houses of the children of Israel, whose doors had been sprinkled with the blood of a Lamb that was slain (see Exodus xii.) The Lord's Supper was ordained by Christ Himself, in remembrance of the still greater deliverance from the bondage of sin and Satan, effected by Christ

Himself for His people when He offered Himself without spot to God "as the very Paschal Lamb Who has taken away the sin of the world; Who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising again hath restored us to everlasting life." In vain the Lamb for the Jew, unless his doorposts were sprinkled with the blood of the Lamb that was slain. In vain Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, unless your hearts are sprinkled by faith with the blood of the Lamb that was slain. And so as the Jew each year kept the feast of the Passover, he was *reminded* of this great deliverance, and as his children should ask in years to come, "What mean ye by this service," he was instructed to say, "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when He smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses." And so as the Christian kneels at the table of the Lord, he is reminded of the wondrous love of Christ dying for him. He contemplates therein the agonies of Gethsemane, the Cross of Calvary. He hears the cry, "It is finished," and he can say "He was wounded for my transgressions; He was bruised for my iniquities, the chastisement of my peace was upon Him, and with His stripes I am healed." Surely, my friends, the contemplation of all this brought before us in the solemn ordinance which He himself instituted on the very night in which He was betrayed is eminently calculated to awaken within the soul feelings of deepest moment! For thus Christ is "evidently set forth crucified amongst us." The Lord's Supper then is to us "for a *memorial*," a memorial of His love in dying for us, whereby He offered Himself "to be a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," and "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come."

But the Lord's Supper is *also a means of grace* The question is put in the Church Catechism, "What are the benefits whereof we are made partakers in the Lord's Supper?" and the answer given is, "The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ as our bodies are by the bread and wine," that is, by natural food. The body of man requires food for its sustenance. Without food the body would soon sink and perish. It is just so with the soul, it requires food; without food it would soon sink and perish. Now CHRIST HIMSELF is the food of the soul. "The true bread that came down from heaven," and He Himself has said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," and the Lord's Supper is the great means of grace whereby we "spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood. The inward part, or thing signified in the Lord's Supper is, as taught by the Church Catechism, "the body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper;" and the minister says to each communicant, "feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving," and thus feeding on Him the soul of the faithful communicant is strengthened and refreshed, faith is increased, love inflamed, hope is animated, and the weary pilgrim goes on his way rejoicing, for "When with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament, then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ and Christ is one with us." Well may we, therefore, join in the prayer of the service, "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us."

There are, indeed, *other views* which I might set before you of the nature and design of this holy ordinance did time permit. I might show you that it is not only a memorial and means of grace, but it is a *communion* whereby the members of the mystical body of Christ, are drawn closer into holy fellowship not only with Christ, their head, but through Him with each other; for St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." It is, indeed "the cup of blessing," wherein we bless God, and "offer and present ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice to Him, and say "All honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end."

II. But are we under any *obligations* to come to this ordinance? and, if so, in *what spirit* should we come? Alas, the practical answer to this question on the part of many who call themselves Christians, and are by birth and baptism members of the Church of England is—"No, we are under no obligation to partake of this ordinance;" for is it not the case that many who attend the services of the Church seldom or never come to this holy communion? Now, are they right or wrong? I say they are wrong; for if it be a *memorial*, surely the Christian should desire to remember the dying love of the Redeemer. If it be a *means of grace* for the strengthening and refreshing of the soul, surely he needs to be strengthened and refreshed in passing though the exhausting atmosphere of this evil and sinful world, and if it be a *sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving* surely he should desire to join in the service with his fellow-Christians in saying, "Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men."

But let us look at the words before us, "This do in remembrance of Me." Now be it remembered

these are the words of Christ—the *command* of Him who is our Master. He claims to be so—"One is your Master, even Christ." "If I be your Master," well may He say to many, "Where is mine honour?" "If ye love Me, keep My commandments." "This do in remembrance of Me." But the words may be taken as the *dying request* of the best of friends—the Friend that sticketh closer than a brother, and who loved us with a love that was stronger than death: one request He left with His people the same night in which He was betrayed, knowing that His work was accomplished, and that He was about to leave His people in a world where they would be tempted to forget Him; He parts from them with this dying request, "This do in remembrance of Me"—do not forget the friend who has done so much for you—who has loved you with a love that was stronger than death; but "do this as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me." He does not ask of His people any great thing—such as a pilgrimage to Rome or Jerusalem—but by a simple ordinance, instituted and ordained by Christ Himself He wishes to be remembered by His people, and therefore leaves with them the small but significant and dying request, "This do in remembrance of Me." "As they were eating," we are told, "He took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to His disciples, and said, Take eat, this is My body; and He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of God." Surely, brethren, in whatever respect we view the words, whether as the *command*, the *counsel*, or the *dying request* of our blessed Lord, we cannot safely neglect the use of this sacred ordinance.

But it may be asked "*In what spirit shall I come*"? This is indeed a most important question, and I shall endeavour to give you a plain answer to the question. Turning then again to the Church Catechism—and you cannot find better instruction on the subject of the holy communion than you will find in the concluding part of the Catechism, it is the best tract on the subject that I know of, given with the authority of the Church—the question is asked, "What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper," and the answer is given, "To examine themselves whether they repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life, have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of His death, and be in charity with all men." Here there are *three things* set before us as to the spirit in which we should come—Repentance, Faith, and Charity, or Christian love—"To examine ourselves." And that, "by the rule of God's commandments," as in God's sight, looking for God's help and crying, "Search me, O God, and try my heart, and see if there be any wicked way in me." In this spirit "let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup" (1 Cor. xi. 28). Let him examine himself as to whether he *repents truly* of his former sins, testing the truth of his repentance by the determination of his soul, as to whether "he steadfastly purposes to lead a new, that is, a Christian life." And in this spirit we are taught to say, "We acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against Thy Divine Majesty, provoking most justly Thy wrath and indignation against us; we do earnestly repent and are heartily sorry for these our misdoings."

But we must further examine ourselves as to whether we have *a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ.* This is absolutely necessary, for "without faith it is impossible," in this or in any other ordinance, "to please God." "The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith," saith the 29th Article of our Church, "although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do they eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing." And this faith should have special reference to *Christ Himself*, and to "the innumerable benefits which by His precious bloodshedding He hath obtained for us," and therefore should be always accompanied and followed with "a thankful remembrance of His death."

And then we should examine ourselves as to whether we "be in *charity with all men.*" The necessity of this will be seen from the nature of the ordinance, for be it remembered it is "a *Communion* of the body and blood of Christ," in which in faith and love we kneel together at the table of our Lord, and we, "being many are one bread and one body," and to this agree the words of our Lord: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."

And these three things, Repentance, Faith, and Charity, which are said "to be required of them who come to the Lord's Supper," are summed up in the earnest exhortation addressed "to them that come to receive the Holy Communion"—"Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways; draw near with faith, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort, and make your humble confession to Almighty God, meekly kneeling upon your knees."

In this spirit draw near to the table of your Lord. Jesus bids you, He commands, He invites, He re-

quests you; do not turn a deaf ear to His call. "Eat," He says, "O friends, and drink of the cup of love which I have mingled." Do not put off, pleading that you are "so occupied" with business or pleasure that you cannot come now; 'tis dangerous to delay. Be not afraid to come, saying "I am not worthy;" you never can make yourself worthy, but come *deeply sensible of your unworthiness*, confessing that "you are unworthy through your manifold sins and transgressions to offer unto Him any sacrifice, but praying Him to accept this your bounden duty and service, not weighing your merits, but pardoning your offences through Jesus Christ our Lord." JESUS WILL MEET YOU AT HIS TABLE; He will manifest Himself unto you in breaking of bread; He will cheer, strengthen, and comfort you with His presence, till you shall no longer need the aid of means and ordinances here below; but life's brief journey over and life's battle ended, you shall join the ranks of the Church triumphant above, and sit down at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb, when you shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed you, and shall lead you unto living fountains of waters, and God, even God Himself, shall wipe away all tears from your eyes. Amen.

"FREEDOM AND TRUTH."

BY THE REV. JOHN PENFOLD.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. JAMES', MARYLEBONE, W.

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—JOHN viii. 32.

TO get at the drift of Jesus's teaching it is always as well to understand whom he was talking to, and what he was talking about. This has the advantage of blocking out any theological glosses (which are generally misleading and often mischievous) and of throwing valuable sidelights derived from local and historical conditions. It would seem from this chapter of St. John that Jesus had just had a breach with some of the Pharisees, to whom He had spoken in very plain language. This had the effect of increasing His following in some quarters, and of weakening it in others. Notably some of His Jewish adherents began to waver; we get the hint in the words, "To those Jews which *had* believed Him." He warns those waverers, "If ye abide in My word, then are ye truly My disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It was more than a caution, it was a challenge. Jesus was a brave leader, He wanted no half-hearted followers. He openly invites the doubting Jews to do one thing or the other, to take up the cross, and carry it, or else put it down.

Now the circumstances of those Jews form the very best commentary on these words. In the first place their boast was a mere brag, "we have never yet been in bondage"; politically they were at that moment in bondage, soon to become definite and very oppressive. But the severest bondage of the Jew was moral and spiritual, the iron of literalism had entered into the very soul of the nation. Making the Word of God of none effect through their traditions—covering up the Divine message of the law of Moses with a mass of incrustations which nearly smothered it—the Jews were in a state of spiritual bondage which was sapping their national life. We need not delay over the regulations, vexatious and even ridiculous, which bound down the daily life of an orthodox Jew; you will find them scattered up and down the Scriptures, the main result of them is enough. It is not too much to say that they had reduced the Jews to a nation of hypocrites. Professing adherence to a law which was in many points absolutely contrary to nature, and yet having by no means got rid of the natural man in their own constitutions, they were always between the devil of practice and the deep sea of precept—we will not say principle. The human nature within them kept surging up against the arbitrary barriers which generations of hair-splitting commentators and expounders had raised. Since they could not be openly broken through they had to be evaded. Wholesale evasion blunted the moral sense and whetted the disposition to take advantage of technical forms and expressions, to the utter destruction of the spirit of the Mosaic system. Conformity became compatible with rascality, and a man's morals might be just what he pleased, so long as he was regular at the synagogue and sound on the Sabbath.

This was probably why the neighbouring races, even in the first century of our era, had come to despise the Jews. Romans, Greeks, Egyptians, Persians, were no better than one another, and their faults were national and general, but they could not understand the position of the Jew, with his loud professions of moral superiority, who turned out, after all, to be rather worse, if anything, than his neighbours. Perhaps too, it was this unprecedented national training in duplicity, extending over many centuries, which fixed and stamped that occasional tendency to deviation from strict truth which not uncommonly characterises the descendants of Jacob. It was with full knowledge of the moral and spiritual position of the Jews of his time, and with direct reference to it that Jesus spoke the caution, "If ye abide in My word, then are ye truly My disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

If Jesus were to come down into our streets this afternoon and walk in and out among us, looking into our social system, with its pretences, its shams, its heavy burdens, its laws and regulations which we all eloquently profess, and diligently evade,

these would be about the first words He would say to us. He would look with wonder and pity upon the bondage of our existence, upon the mass of falsehood and folly with which we have weighted our chains, and upon the complicated and artificial moral blinkers which we have invented to hide the real facts from our eyes. Overcome with wonder, that, with the boundless freedom of truth open to us, we should be content to make such slaves of ourselves, He would invite us to act up to our professions, "If ye abide in My word, then are ye truly My disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Needless to add, we should answer Him after the manner of our Hebrew prototypes, with trite allusions to the British flag, etc., etc., and possibly the worst amongst us would saunter off, like the Jewish loafer of old, with some jeer or sneer, "Thou hast a devil."

Believe me, there never was a time when the warning that freedom only consists in truth was more wanted. The older one grows the more impressive becomes the fact, that truth is the one thing in life worth aiming at and fighting for. I am speaking of truth in the most general terms, as that element of firmness and uprightness which gives muscle and backbone to character—the resolution to see things as they are, and so to deal with them.

> "Justum, et tenacem propositi virum
> Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
> Non vultus instantis tyranni,
> Mente quatit solida."

If this was the ideal character even of a writer whom I suppose the missionaries would speak of as "a poor 'eathen," we might perhaps expect to find it a little more common than it unfortunately is in a nineteenth-century-end Christian community.

Test the commonest aspects of our social life by this touchstone of truth, and you will understand how it is that we can only be free so long as we are true. A certain poet has remarked, "Stone walls do not a prison make, nor iron bars a cage," which is poor poetry, but sound sense; there is a freedom which is independent of fetters, and there is also a bondage which exists apart from chains. There is, for instance, the bondage of fashion—not only fashion in dress—men maintain two passions in common with their cousins the monkeys, the passion for imitation and the passion for variety; and so long as they remain in us, we shall retain those kaleidoscopic eccentricities in costume which are always absurd, but generally harmless. I am speaking of the errors and follies, and worse, which characterise the social life of all classes. Everybody in this church knows perfectly well that he constantly does things which are silly and wicked, simply because they are done by other people. They are the fashion. A few years ago it was the fashion to get drunk, and everybody of course was in the fashion. That fashion has happily passed away, but it has been succeeded by others. We play idiotic games at cards, we gamble, we smoke cigarettes to excess, often against our inclination, and sometimes absolutely to our discomfort, all because it is the fashion. Yes, and we do worse. We allow ourselves to drift into all kinds of vices, we sin, as it were, with a cart-rope, we mar the image of God within us, and betray the trust placed in us by others, and ruin our own self-reliance and self-respect, without even the poor excuse that the temptation was greater than we could bear. Young men at college, young men who have lately joined the Army or the Navy, young men and young women too who have lately begun the battle of life as members of any community in which neither freedom nor responsibility is fully understood or appreciated, tell me if I am not right. The time will come when the Apostle Paul will put his question to you, "What profit had you in the things whereof ye are now ashamed?" You had no profit, you had not even much pleasure, you did them because they were, in a miserable and degraded sense, the fashion. You would give your body now, perhaps, for the sin of your soul, but you have become a slave to the fashion and the sin; it is only steady, true resolve, and firm continued striving upwards that will release you—*Sursum Corda*—Lift up your hearts, "ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

There is the bondage of cliques and sets, a very terrible and overpowering kind of bondage. Somehow or other when a man gets into some particular groove in society he hardly seems able to call his soul his own. His friends are chosen for him, his wife is chosen for him, his church is chosen for him, rebellion against such dictation never seems to enter his head. If it did, social extinction would follow, and that would be dreadful. He will spend his money, he will cut his connections, he will alter his politics, he will tamper with his conscience, and even change his creed, but he will not fall out of his set.

A man comes into our neighbourhood whom we would like to know; he seems a good sort of fellow, his example and influence are generally on the right side, there is something good to be got out of him. It is not, however, customary to ask about all this; his conduct, his character, his morals are all quite secondary to the main question, Is our particular set going to take him up? I have seen men who have lived within a few yards of one another for twenty years who might have become the best friends, to their great mutual advantage, and who have never interchanged a dozen syllables; they would have liked to, but society ordered otherwise. I have known other men who were stained with many crimes, not known to the penal-code perhaps, but known well enough, or pretty clearly guessed at by their associates—impure and vicious men,

violent and self-indulgent men, dishonest men. But they were received by society, and no one has had the courage to say, "I will not take this man's hand, I will not by association with him degrade my wife and daughters, or pollute the privacy of my home." It is a terrible thing, this social bondage which compels men to call darkness light and light darkness, to stand aloof from those they know to be good, and to associate on terms of sham intimacy with those they feel are unclean and bad. Here is scope for firmness of character and strength of purpose, seldom enough exercised. We are apt to complain of the amount of veiled evil in the world which is always catching us unawares: if we could only be got to make a beginning with that which stalks abroad at noonday in the midst of us, our complaints would have more force. It is a terrible slavery from which only the truth can make us free, if we could for once understand the truth, and abide by it. Without any definite reference to present political issues, was there ever a time when political parties of all shades were less liked and worse trusted. How few men of leading there are whom we can look up to as strong souls, who will abide by convictions founded on truth and built up by judgment, who can be trusted, if need be, to withstand the *civium ardor, prava jubentium*. And yet the men are good enough if they had their own way; but they are too weak to throw over the wire-pullers, they are under the yoke of what appear to be party interests; black is white to them and white black. They could free themselves if they had a mind to, but they cannot face the consequences: some do not know the truth, and some know it and cannot abide in it. To all politicians I say emphatically, get your convictions first, and when you have got them, stick to them. Don't let them go at the bidding of leaders or at the dictation of committees. Remember that God does not strictly require you to be a Member of Parliament, but he does require you to be an honest man. It is even possible that as a private gentleman of upright character you will be of more use to your generation than half-a-dozen Cabinet Ministers.

Out of the bondage of fashion and society, out of the slavery of politics, there is only one way to freedom possible. It lies in the assertion of the individual character and conscience maintained against the claims of social expediency and utility or pleasure. The man who fails to make this good is lost as an individual in the highest sense of the word, *i.e.*, a single spirit and intelligence acting in direct connection with, and under responsibiltty to, the controlling and limitless moral force which we call God. In this sense individuality is the only kind of freedom which can exist, our responsibility admitted, and absolute free will exerted in every detail as to the ways in which it should be discharged. "If ye abide in My word, then are ye truly My disciples." Immediately an intermediate power is introduced and a double and divided responsibility incurred, freedom and individuality alike are in danger of perishing. The social or political slave loses sight of his direct responsibility, he acts as one of a flock and not on his own judgment; he is as much of a bondman to his set or to his party as the Jew to his debased and degraded law. We lay the flattering unction to our souls that we are, so to speak, Abraham's seed and have never yet been in bondage; the words are vain, and above their clatter comes the message, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

There is bondage to ourselves. What shall I say of the passions to which almost all of us so readily become slaves? It is perfectly obvious to everybody in this church that even the yoke of the world is not more easily put on than that of the devil or the flesh. And what a terrible outlook. Consider the vast amount of national misery and degradation, the grisly calendar of crime, the heritage of shame, disease and death, cripples, deformed, halt, maimed, blind, epileptics, paralytics, lunatics, maniacs, the melancholy army which bears witness to the awful consequences of that dreadful bondage to the passions to which everyone of us is more or less a victim. There is no need to specify particular vices, each one would require a hundred sermons. Here again the words of Jesus justify themselves; there is only one way out of this terrible slavery. "Even Jesus Christ pleased not Himself." The pleasure of the senses is not the chief, nor even a chief good. The cultivation of character, the habit of self-control, the evolution, however slow and painful, of those instincts of responsibility and duty which make an honest and honourable man, these are the constituents of that "truth" in which alone we can find relief from the bondage of the senses. License after all is not liberty; "the truth shall make you free."

There is a painful kind of bondage which springs from want of moral courage. Moral courage is a term you will find easier to use than explain; I take it to mean simply truth. As I said before I am not using the word truth in its narrow sense of truthfulness, that is only a part of it. I take truth to mean that solid foundation of uprightness which underlies all the qualities which go to make up what we call character. The mixed quality of mind and spirit we call moral courage is of course included in it, and you will very soon find out what an important element it is.

Don't make the mistake of supposing that a man who lacks moral courage is a man to be trusted. There have been men whose courage has failed them at critical periods in their career—Cranmer was one of them—and have yet been saints. But in their case the failing was temporary, even momentary, and they have gone on to fight and win their freedom. It is far different with a man

whose want of courage consistently leads him to shirk his responsibilities and duties.

"Man-like it is to fall in sin,
Fiend-like it is to dwell therein."

In such a man you can never have confidence, the habit grows upon him; he began by being a good man, he ends by being next door to a bad one.

There are people whose want of moral courage makes their judgment, for instance, always untrustworthy, and their opinions worthless. The fear of giving offence, the desire to avoid unpleasantness, the constant fruitless attempt to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, result in leaving them trusted by nobody and despised by everybody. You say contemptuously of such a man, "Oh, he is a mere humbug; one day he thinks one thing and quite another the next; he will tell one tale to your face and another behind your back; no one can rely on him." It is quite true, and yet duplicity was not originally part of the man's character, is not now in reality. But he has become a slave to his fears. This is one kind of bondage which want of moral courage involves us in.

Consider the false positions in which men suffer themselves to be placed. Perhaps I am rousing recollections. You have got into some entanglement, you have drifted into some false position. You never sought it, you took little or no pleasure in it; you accepted the position at first because it flattered your vanity and tickled your egoism—ah, that weak point in your character! —and then it was awkward to draw back. At first you feared giving offence, then you feared exposure. So you lived a lie and wore a double face. Then came suspicion, followed by discovery—suspicion and discovery always do come—and you made promises. Yes, you were sincere enough. You saw the thing was bringing ruin into your own family, pain into dearest hearts and severance upon nearest ties, and you made promises. And then you broke them; you could not take the decisive steps, you feared the result in other quarters. And so a great cloud of deceit came down over all your life. Ah, I have known such men, brilliant, gifted, full too of generosity and large affection, who have made such mistakes. Why are you in bondage now? Why do you feel unworthy of the confidence of those who love you? Where has your candour gone? Where is your old frankness? Why do you start at the postman's knock? Why do those letters keep coming to your club which you hate to have and yet cannot be without? Are you not a slave, waiting in suspense till the bolt falls at last which undoes all?

Go home, burn those letters; write the note, have the interview which will relegate those evil things into the limbo of the past. It will give you pain and shame, it will give you enemies, maybe, but it will give you peace. Smitten with the fiery pest of old, the Israelites found relief when they turned their eyes towards the emblem pointing to the heavens. You, chafing at your letters, self-imposed, can only have release by catching at the promise from the lips of Jesus, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have made a grant of £300 in augmentation of the endowment of St. Helen's Vicarage, Witton, near Northwich.

LORD PENRHYN has granted a site for the Church College which is to be established at Bangor. The institution, whose chief object is the training of masters for Church schools, has been at work for many years at Carnarvon; but, the building having been destroyed by fire, its removal to Bangor was decided upon, so that the students can avail themselves of the classes at the University College of North Wales.

BY the death of Miss A. J. Clough, Newnham College, Cambridge, has lost more than its Principal. She and Dr. Henry Sedgwick were the chief founders of the college twenty-one years ago, and even before 1871 she had for many years worked effectively for the higher education of women. But it is these twenty-one years which are the glory of her career. From the time when she took charge of a small house and five students, till last Saturday week, when she laid down the charge of the beautiful college and 140 students, it was one unbroken story of complete and unselfish devotion, of rare tact and skill, and of boundless sympathy. Miss Clough took her full share in conquering the difficulties which were so many in the early days of the college. She guarded against possible dangers with watchful and minute care, and constantly avoided all eccentricity and useless notoriety. Prejudice and even thoughtful objection were apt to fade before the dignity, modesty, and motherliness of her appearance and manner, which were more effective than many arguments; though she was ready, too, when needful, with persuasive and forcible words. But it was most of all in her relation to her students that Miss Clough was remarkable and admirable. Her rule was a fine combination of that trust which is so ennobling to the trusted, with a constant and powerful influence; this influence arising from her quick insight into character, her deep interest in and love for her charges, her skill and originality in suggestion, the attractiveness of her intensely characteristic personality, and, above all, from her simple goodness. With Miss Clough, once a student always a student; they might go to the ends of the earth, and only be nearer to her heart; the epitaph of her relation to her students is written in the Book of Wisdom—"Faithful in love." She has emphatically been a teacher in the fruitful field of courage, unselfishness, and lofty aims, but rather by deeds than words; her "memory and good example" are to hundreds a precious and most inspiring possession. Her occasional earnest words on religion were the more impressive from her reverent reticence. Miss Clough seemed happy in her life, and happy in the death which came peacefully while still at work. On Saturday, March 5th, after a most beautiful and solemn service in King's College Chapel (where Miss Clough habitually attended service on Sunday mornings), she was buried in the quiet churchyard of Grantchester. The sight in the great chapel was one never to be forgotten.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 2, 1892.

THE PUBLIC AND THE PROCTORS.

THE enlightened organs of opinion which raised such an outcry a few months ago about the girl Daisy Hopkins and her grievance have observed a curious reticence upon the subsequent developments of her case. They cannot, however, be suffered to go scot free. Some time ago this young woman was arrested by the Proctor at Cambridge, tried by the Vice-Chancellor, and sentenced. Apparently it is unbearable to certain personages that anybody at all should ever be tried or sentenced; at all events a great fuss was made, and as the authorities had evidently acted quite legally in this case, the only thing to do was to accuse them of injustice, and pretend their "victim" was innocent. This was accordingly done very thoroughly, and for a moment it appeared that the English constitution was in serious danger from the tyranny of the respectable elderly gentleman who presides over the Court of the University of Cambridge. Certainly the inhabitants of that town were in parlous state, their reputation, their personal liberty, and even the sanctity of their homes were perpetually jeopardised by the brutal violence of an irresponsible authority and its desperate myrmidons. A great case was got up against the University, which, it seemed must inevitably succumb. We pointed out at the time that this was all nonsense, that it all resolved itself into a lawfully-constituted Court trying a prisoner properly arrested under suspicious circumstances, and, in the event, properly convicted and sentenced. The only difference between the case of Daisy Hopkins and that of the women arrested in hundreds every week by the Metropolitan Police is that Hopkins was probably treated with more consideration and less roughly handled. The issue has justified us. Urged on thereto by certain foolish enthusiasts on one hand, and a sensation-seeking and prurient populace on the other, Hopkins was foolish enough to bring an action for damages against the Proctor, which has resulted in the complete discomfiture of herself and her friends. A jury has decided that the Proctor was quite right, and so obvious was the case for the defendant that he was content almost to prove it by the evidence called on behalf of the plaintiff, which was apparently quite enough to condemn her.

It would, we suppose, be too much to invite the journals which have canonised this woman Hopkins to admit their error and tender an apology. The ethics of journalism evidently include the maxim, "Tell a lie and stick to it." Having loudly asserted that she was innocent, these cacophanous scribes will at least burke the fact that she is guilty, if they can't hide it. But the lesson remains, that the Proctor's and the Vice-Chancellor's Court at Cambridge still exercise a salutary jurisdiction, and that their functions and powers are neither unnecessary nor excessive. We can only regret that a postcard from Mr. Gladstone and an interview with a *Pall Mall Gazette* reporter were not included in the case of the plaintiff in Hopkins *v.* Wallis.

The population of Southend must have spent a really "happy" day last Sunday. It is not often that a congregation enjoys the spectacle of an incumbent advancing to the reading desk while his curate performs a quick change into a surplice in a front pew and both proceed to officiate at the same moment in different keys. The interest of the scene was increased by the appearance of a guard of warders and sidesmen in the aisle, and the subsequent entrance of a couple of policemen. Apparently the congregation was divided in its allegiance, for the incumbent having warned the "person who is interrupting" that serious consequences would follow, invited those present who agreed with him to "notify the same" by holding up their hands, an appropriate and dignified ceremony which was immediately performed. The *finale* then came in a rough and tumble between the curate and the constables, in which the latter were victorious, and the curate was marched to the station in his surplice, which he refused to doff. We can only regret that the curate, a Mr. Waller, will probably escape the punishment he deserves for his offensive conduct. At the same time we can only regret that the incumbent, who bears the euphonious name of Snosswell, should not have shown better judgment. Even such a name as Snosswell need not imply absolute want of common sense and ordinary self-respect, to say nothing of a little tact and prudence. Mr. Snosswell, no doubt, was in a difficult position, but he is not entirely free from blame in this disgraceful case.

CANON COULSON is on the point of resigning the living of Bramley, near Guildford.

THE BOOK OF ARMAGH.

By the late most Rev. WILLIAM REEVES, D.D., LL.D., M.B., M.R.I.A.; Hon. Mem. Soc. Antiqq., Scot. and Zurich, Archbishop of Armagh.

St. Patrick, with whom was associated, in the Middle Ages, St. John the Baptist, has been regarded for thirteen hundred years as the Patron Saint of the Irish nation. That is, in the ages of simple belief he was looked upon with veneration as the honoured instrument by whom Christianity was brought into this country; and in the ages of ignorant superstition, his memory had degenerated into a sort of visionary conception, as of one who, at some date between the Christian era and the subjugation of Ireland, had materially revolutionised the natural history of the island, and freed it from noxious existences, both spiritual and material. His day is the seventeenth of March. By *his day* is meant the period of his death; that is, his death in the body; for the early church regarded a good man's departure from this world as the date of his *real* birth, when, leaving the womb of time, he entered upon the bright and unrestricted enjoyment of those scenes which are associated with eternity. The Church of Christ, borrowing the inspired sentiment of the Wise Man, held that "the day of death is better than the day of one's birth"; and, for this reason, made this "better season" the cardinal note of time in the history of her honoured sons. This is the origin of the Christian Calendar; and the names which stand opposite the various days of the year belonged to those who, at their respective seasons, closed a career of faith and labour, which resulted in the extension of true religion, and the fruition of their own inheritance.

Who could tell, when the infant Succath was a nursing, and the memory of his birth was still fresh at Dumbarton, that he was destined to be the Apostle of Ireland? or who, in after times, when the generation of his parents had passed away, knew, but himself, what was his birth-day, or cared to record an event which was only memorable in its consequences? The burning of Diana's temple at Ephesus fixed the birth-day of Alexander the Great, and the death of St. Boece of Monasterboice afforded a note for the nativity of St. Columbkille; but such accidental coincidences were of rare occurrence, and more rarely observed.

Our saint died on the 17th of March, after a long life, devoted unreservedly to the glorious work of Erin's Christianisation. It was a day to be much observed, and for this reason is the best established note of time in the traditional history of this great and good man.

In the Book of Armagh, at the end of the tract called "St. Patrick's Confession," is the memorandum, written before the year 807, "Huc usque volumen quod Patricius manu conscripsit sua. Septima decima Martii die translatus est Patricius ad cælos"; that is, "Thus far the volume which Patrick indited with his own hand. On the 17th day of March he was translated to heaven." But the reader possibly is unacquainted with the history of the remarkable volume from which this passage is cited, and to inform him on the subject is the object of this memoir.

The Book of Armagh, so-called because it was the most precious literary possession of the church of Armagh, is a small, thick quarto, measuring in height, $7\frac{3}{4}$ inches; in breadth, $5\frac{3}{4}$; and in thickness, $2\frac{1}{4}$; consisting of 221 vellum leaves, on each side of which the writing appears in double columns. The penmanship is of extreme elegance, and is admirable throughout for its distinctness and uniformity. There is no date entered in the book; but the scribe's name, Ferdomnach, appears in several parts of it; and we know from the ancient Irish annals what was the period at which he lived. At the year 845 is recorded "the death of Ferdomach, the wise and very admirable scribe of Armagh." Internal evidence proves that part of the volume, namely, that containing the Gospel of St. Matthew, was finished on the 21st of September, about 807. Thus an age is assigned to this national monument, which, though it falls far short of that of many other manuscripts, particularly those of the Greek Scriptures, is yet of very respectable antiquity, when it numbers its ten centuries and a-half. The language it is written in is Latin, such as was current in the Western church during the early and Middle Ages. But what renders it an object of special interest is the fact that it is *the only copy of the New Testament Scriptures* which has been transmitted to our issue from the ancient Irish Church. Ireland was in early times famous for the ample manner in which it was provided with copies of the Scriptures, and was much resorted to as a safe, peaceable, and well-furnished field for religious study. But one after another, the books of sacred learning perished: what the Danes spared, fire consumed; and what was fortified against the devouring element, by damp soon became the prey of decay and rottenness. And thus, of all the Bibles which existed, not one copy of the Old Testament has been preserved, or of any part thereof, except a mutilated copy of the Psalms of David; and the existence of this we owe to the veneration in which it was held, being supposed to be in St. Columba's handwriting, and encased in a costly shrine of silver. Copies of the Gospels, more or less perfect, possessing all the characteristics of the Irish school of writing, are preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, of which the Books of Kells and Durrow are the most beautiful. A collection of St. Paul's Epistles, copied by an Irish scribe, and enriched with interlinear Irish notes, is to be seen at Wurtzberg, in Bavaria; but the Gospels, and other parts of the New Testament, are wanting. Thus the Book of Armagh, to the lover of sacred antiquities, stands forth without a rival in the whole range of Irish literature.

The volume commences with certain memoirs of St. Patrick, which were compiled about the year 750. They fill about forty pages, and contain a large amount of information of an early and very curious kind. They are the oldest and most authentic notices of the saint now in existence, and all other biographies of him either borrow from, or enlarge upon, them. In a philological point of view they are of extreme interest, as possessing the most ancient specimen of the Irish language which is known to exist—Irish, as it was written eleven hundred years ago. Surely the book which, as regards religion, exhibits the only existing copy of the New Testament that was used in the Irish Church — as regards history, contains the earliest account of the Apostle of Ireland—and, as regards literature, the oldest *relique* of the ancient language of the country—has just claims upon the admiration and attention of all true patriots.

Next to the memoirs follows a tract called the "Confession of St. Patrick," written in Latin, and

setting forth in simple and unpolished, but earnest language, a brief statement of the author's early life, his religious sentiments, and the difficulties he experienced in his missionary labours.

After this follows St. Jerom's Preface to the New Testament, and then the Gospels in their usual order. In the Lord's Prayer, in the 6th of St. Matthew we find, instead of the usual expression, *et ne nos inducas in temptationem*, "lead us not into temptation," *et ne patiaris nos induci in temptationem*, "and suffer us not to be led into temptation." This alteration, which is found in some of the early Fathers, and in most of the Irish copies of the Gospels, is not sanctioned by the original Greek, which expresses the sentiment as we commonly do in the English form, but was introduced (as it is sometimes at the present day continued) by persons of pious feelings, but weak and somewhat presumptuous judgments, who, impressed with the statement in James i. 13, "neither tempteth He any man," took upon themselves to reduce this passage to conformity, as they judged it, with the tenor of other parts of Scripture, and in so doing, tampered with the inspired Word of God.

In the enumeration of the twelve Apostles, opposite the name of Judas Iscariot, the word *trogaun* is entered in the margin, which signifies "wretch," to denote the writer's abhorrence of the traitor's character. In St. Matthew xxvii. 50 occurs the interpolated passage, "Then one, having received a spear, pierced his side, and there came out water and blood. Jesus then, crying with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost." The statement of St. John xix. 34 is inserted before the final clause in St. Matthew's account; and thus, contrary to the laws of the human system, the evidence of dissolution is made to precede the moment of decease: notwithstanding which, the passage stands so in the majority of the Irish copies of this Gospel, as well as in some early versions and Fathers; and seems to have obtained such wide acceptation, that Pope Clement V., at the Council of Vienna, in 1311, condemned it as false and heretical.

At the end of St. Matthew occurs a prayer of the writer in Latin, of which the following is a translation: —"O God, whose mercy is unbounded, and whose holiness passeth speech, with humble voice have I boldness to implore that, like as Thou didst call Matthew to be a chosen Apostle, from being a receiver of custom; so, of Thy compassion, Thou wilt vouchsafe to direct my steps during this life into the perfect way; and place me in the angelic choir of the heavenly Jerusalem, that, on the everlasting throne of endless joy, I may be deemed worthy to join with the harmonious praises of archangels in ascribing honour to Thee; through Thy only begotten Son, who liveth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, throughout all ages. Amen." This beautiful aspiration, which closely resembles the Collect for St. Matthew's Day, now in use, was probably an adaptation to the writer's individual case of the form which occurred in the ancient Irish ritual at this saint's festival.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"The Treasury." March, 1892.

Were it necessary to judge by the first half of this valuable compendium of clerical thought, we should not be able to form a high estimate of it, for this month it certainly has not kept up the usual standard of universal interest. The first sermon is rather dry; the second, on Biblical Criticism, ought to be relegated to the position of a Paper or Essay, while the "Preaching to Great Cities" comes under the head of "Helps in Pastoral Work." Of the "Leading Thoughts" there is not one which it would be easy to use for the average mind; we desire again to suggest more concise and certainly more classified notes under this heading if *The Treasury* is to fulfil the condition of a real staff on which the reliant parson may rest when in need. On the other hand, the papers on "Higher Education" and on "Amusements" are both very able and worth reading.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

CARDINAL NEWMAN A PLAGIARIST.

Sir,—The epithet "plagiarist" is objected to by "J. A. C." as applied to Cardinal Newman. A plagiarist is generally understood to mean a writer who borrows without acknowledging that he does so. Sancta Clara's book and Tract 90 agree in substance and in form in a manner that cannot be called accidental, and that without any acknowledgement of obligation on Newman's part. Let any of your readers compare the two books, and he will be at once struck with their extraordinary resemblance. It is not merely that they teach the same doctrine, but they teach it in the same way. They are the only two books, so far as my knowledge extends, which go through the Thirty-nine Articles one by one, emptying them, or attempting at least to empty them, of all anti-Romish meaning.

Sancta Clara's method of reconciling the two churches did not commend itself, as Dr. Lee naïvely tells us, to the High Church School of that age, and it incurred grave suspicion at the Court of Rome. But things are altered now, and Tract 90 has become the recognised standard of theology with a party which treats Archbishop Tait as an ignoramus.

"J. A. C." asks me on what authority I have stated that Sancta Clara was a "pervert"? My authority is Dr. Lee's reprint of his "most interesting" book. In a sketch of the life of the author prefixed to it, the Dr. tells us that his real name was Christopher Davenport (Davenant was a slip of the pen); that he and his brother John went up to Oxford and matriculated as commoners at Merton College under Sir Henry Savile's Wardenship; that these two brothers, as often happens, took opposite sides, John becoming "a noted Puritan," while Christopher joined the Church of Rome; that he became, not a Dominican (as "J. A. C." says), but a Franciscan monk, and rose to be at least three times Provincial of the English Franciscans; that he was a *persona grata* at the Courts of Charles I. and Charles II., being attached to the households of Henrietta Maria, and Catherine of Braganza; that he had much influence, and died in 1680.

Many English divines have been charged with leaning towards Rome, besides that learned sycophant, Bishop Montagu; but I am not aware of any of them having attempted to get rid of the plain sense of the Articles in the deliberate and thorough way in which

Sancta Clara does it, and in which Newman has certainly followed him.

I certainly was not aware that his *expositio* was a well known book at the time of the publication of Tract 90. Dr. Lee speaks of the edition, from which he has taken his reprint as being extremely scarce, one of them not being found even in the Bodleian.

Mr. Oakley's pamphlet on Tract 90, to which "J. A. C." refers, was written *after* it, and consequently decides nothing as to whether Sancta Clara's book was well known or not *before* it; and naturally Dr. Newman's friends would not be forward with a charge of plagiarism.

C. P. M.

FAITH AS A FACULTY.

SIR,—In the second line of the third paragraph of my letter on the above subject which you were good enough to insert in to-day's PULPIT, there is a mistake which I would be obliged by your allowing me to correct. I allude to the word "unthinking," which ought to be "thinking." Of course, too, θῶρον in the fourth line of the same letter ought to be δῶρον.

Allow me to say also how gratified I am by Mr. J. J. Murphy's kind intimation that he agrees with me on the subject of my letter. There are few of your correspondents I would more gladly have in agreement with me than Mr. Murphy.

W. T. HOBSON.

March 19th, 1892.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION.

SIR,—I see that "Vindex," in the PULPIT of to-day, brings forward the doctrine of annihilation or extinction of being as one that must recommend itself to intelligent Christians. I may be allowed to say that it has always been particularly repugnant to my own mind. It appears to me to charge God with foolishness, with great waste of energy, contrivance, adaptation, in producing high faculties of mind and heart in men, allowing them to exhibit great powers, and then dooming them to entire extinction. To me, it does not seem to fit in with the great plan of Creation and Providence as unfolded in the works and word of God, that the greatest defects, intellectual and moral, should be cured in some, while untold multitudes with similar defects should cease to exist. Why should not mental and moral defects be cured in all? Are there not adequate resources for that purpose in the Scheme of Redemption? I had some correspondence with the eminent F. D. Maurice, and as I could not clearly apprehend from his writings what degree of hope he had for mankind, I made the enquiry. His reply in a letter I now have before me, dated July 7th, 1868, is as follows: "I always feel that if I do not despair for myself, I cannot, must not despair for any man, here and anywhere." He apparently believed that none were so bad that they could not be cured.

I have been reading the Bible all my life, and I can say with truth, that no passage has ever suggested to me extinction of being. As far as my knowledge goes, which is very imperfect, the Hebrew word *olam* and the Greek word *aion* do not mean endless. An American writer, Dr. Edward Beecher, said: "*Olam* and *aion* are used to denote the eternity of God, the antiquity of the mighty antediluvian giants, the antiquity of the ancestors of Abraham, the ancient ages of the inhabitants of Canaan. They are applied to the Covenant with Abraham, to the Mosaic system, even in its details such as the priesthood, the Passover, the olive-oil in the lamps, the wearing of linen breeches by priests, etc., etc."

"Vindex" says this was the primitive doctrine in the early Church. Dr. Beecher, Henry Ward Beecher, and several German writers have told us that the belief in universal restoration generally prevailed until the fifth century.

J. B.

Canonbury, 19th March, 1892.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anderson, Rev. E. P., M.A., Curate of St. Thomas's, Nottingham; Vicar of St. Peter's, Littleover, near Derby.

Brown, Rev. J. Fannin; Vicar of Ewyas-Harold, Herefordshire.

Buchanan, Rev. J. Harry, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Ilkeston; Vicar of Shirebrook, Mansfield.

Burrows, Rev. Winfrid Oldfield, M.A.; Lecturer of the Parish Church, Leeds.

Curtoys, Rev. W. F., M.A., Vicar of Coleby; Assistant-Examiner in Religious Knowledge in the Diocese of Lincoln.

Drummond, Rev. Henry Murray; Vicar of Worminghall, Bucks.

Drury, Rev. John Frederick William, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.

Golland, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Glasson, Lancaster; Vicar of St. James's, Shireshead, Garstang.

Hare, Rev. Marmaduke, Vicar of Christ Church, Watney-street, St. George's-in-the-East; Rector of Bow.

Harries, Rev. Evan, Vicar of Christ Church, Pendlebury; Rector of St. Wilfred's, Ribchester-with-St. Saviour's, Stidd, Lancashire.

Hayman, Rev. Henry Telford, Vicar of Perlethorpe, Ollerton; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Notts.

Jones, Rev. G. Lloyd; Rector of Kettlebaston, Ipswich.

Lancaster, Rev. T. Turner, M.A., Senior Curate of Holy Trinity, Poulton-le-Sands; to the charge of St. Augustine's Mission district at Huncoat, in the parish of St. James's, Church Kirk, Accrington.

Lavanchy, Rev. C. J. L., Curate of St. Columb Minor and Newquay; Vicar of St. Colan, Cornwall.

Lee, Rev. Robert Elton, M.A.; Vicar of Holme-Lacey, Herefordshire.

Maclean, Rev. Arthur John, M.A., Honorary Canon of Cumbrae; Dean of Argyll and the Isles.

Malachi, Rev. W. W., St. Mary-the-Virgin's, Auchindoir; Rector of St. Laurence's, Laurencekirk.

Mustard, Rev. David, M.A.; Rector of Little Oakley, Essex.

Nicholson, Rev. Thomas, L.Th.; Perpetual Curate of St. John's, Sunderland.

Nunn, Rev. H. D. C., M.A., Vicar of Sharow; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.

Orbell, Rev. T., M.A., Curate of Findern, Derbyshire; Vicar of Hapton, Norfolk.

Parkinson, Rev. T. E., Rector of Cowesby; Vicar of Over Silton, by dispensation.

Pigott, Rev. G. H. Smyth; Rector of Kingston Seymour, Somerset.

Playfair, Rev. C. S. M., Curate of Buckingham; Vicar of Stoke Lyne, near Bicester, Oxon.

Plummer, Rev. Frederick Matthew, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Stephen's, Ayres' Quay, Sunderland.

Rees, Rev. John Francis, B.A.; Perpetual Curate of Abertillery, Monmouthshire.

Remington, Rev. Henry; Vicar of Bellerby, Bedale.

Rhodes, Rev. Alfred H., Senior Curate of Christ Church, Claughton, Cheshire; Incumbent of Holy Innocents', Liverpool.

Richards, Rev. Edward, Curate of St. George's, Bolton; Vicar of Osmotherley, Yorks.

Rowlands, Rev. George Daniel, M.A.; Rector of Grindon, near Leek.

Richardson, Rev. Marmaduke Cheyne, B.A., Senior Curate of S.S. Andrew and Philip, North Kensington; Chaplain of All Souls' Cemetery, Kensal-green, and General Preacher in the Diocese of London.

Salusbury, Rev. Folliott Lynch, M.A.; Rector of Market Overton, Oakham.
Shaw, Rev. John Hall, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Ball's-pond; Vicar of Ventnor, Isle of Wight.
Sharrock, Rev. W. R., M.A., Vicar of Driffield; Surrogate.
Shaw-Stewart, Rev. C. R., M.A.; Vicar of Temple-Balsall, Warwickshire.
Short, Rev. Ambrose, M.A., Vicar of Bodicote, Banbury; Rector of Saham-Toney, Norfolk.
Sinclair, Ven. William M., Archdeacon of London; Honorary Chaplain of the Highland Association of London, and the Royal Caledonian Asylum.
Smith, Rev. Brice; Rector of Hameringham-with-Scrafield, Horncastle.
Smyth, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Markby; Vicar of Sutton-on-Sea, Alford, Lincolnshire.
Stanbridge, Rev. John, Vicar of Scropton; Vicar of Ratley, Warwickshire.
Stenning, Rev. G. C., M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Alton; Rector of Bishopstoke.
Summerhayes, Rev. Henry, M.A., Curate and Lecturer at the Parish Church, Boston; Vicar of Stroud.
Thompson, Rev. Arthur Steinkopff, B.D.; Vicar of Little Marlow, Bucks.
Thompson, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Hunslet; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
Thorpe, Rev. John H., B.D., Rector of St. Peter's, Cork; Vicar of St. Saviour's, Nottingham.
Tollinton, Rev. R. B., B.A.; Resident Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.
Tristram, Rev. Canon; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Durham, Sir W. Gray.
Turner, Rev. Joseph, B.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. George's, Liverpool.
Vincent, Rev. George Herbett, M.A.; Vicar of St. John's, Walham-green.
Wayne, Rev. W. H. F., Vicar of Sheldon; Private Chaplain to Lieutenant-Colonel Cornwall Legh, High Legh Hall, Cheshire.
Wigg, Rev. S. Wathen, Rector of Anstey; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Leicestershire.
Wilkinson, Rev. William Henry, Curate of Warminster; Vicar of South Milton, Kingsbridge, Devon.
Williams, Rev. Charles Nathaniel, M.A.; Vicar of West Haddon, Rugby.
Williams, Rev. William Henry, B.A.; Rector of Langston, Monmouthshire.
Winder, Rev. Thomas E., Curate of St. Mary's, Great Sankey, Warrington; Succentor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and Warden of the Cathedral Choir School.
Wood, Rev. John G., Vicar of Conisbrough, Rotherham; Vicar of Ormesby, Middlesbrough.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bassett, Rev. R. E., for forty years Vicar of North Thoresby, at North Thoresby, on the 17th ult., aged 76.
Bullock, Rev. G. M., B.D., late Vicar of Chalfont St. Peter, Bucks, and sometime Vicar of St. Giles, Oxford, at Fillwood House, Kingswood, Bristol, on the 27th ult., aged 76.
Dickson, Rev. Edward Henry Wathen, late Vicar of Little Ouseburn, York, and Ugborough, Devon, at Wimbledon, on the 20th ult., aged 54.
Dixon, Rev. Godwin Hope, M.A., late Rector of Compton Greenfield, Bristol, at Stonehouse Lodge, Clevedon, on the 27th ult., aged 62.
Geadowe, Rev. Richard William, B.A., Rector of Frodesley, Salop, at the Rectory, Frodesley, on the 17th ult., aged 45.
Harrison, Rev. Jasper Nicolls, for forty-eight years Vicar of Laugharne, Carmarthenshire, at the Vicarage, Laugharne, on the 26th ult., aged 83.
Henderson, Rev. Henry Egdell, Vicar of Alwinton-with-Holystone, on the 26th ult., aged 41.
Powell, Rev. Henry, late Rector of Stanningfield, on the 20th ult., aged 52.
Sanders, Rev. Robert, M.A., for thirty-eight years Vicar of Cropthorne, at Cropthorne, on the 23rd ult., aged 91.
Sharp, Rev. H. I., Hon. Canon of Ely and Rural Dean, on the 17th ult., aged 58.
Smith, Rev. J. C., late Vicar of King Sterndale, Derbyshire, at Buxton, on the 22nd ult., aged 67.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time my vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitated for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for morethan an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses Mr. Harness's Electropathic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restoring appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT.

By Ven. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey, on Sunday, March 20th, 1892.

"Thou shalt not covet."—Exodus xx. 17.

IF it would be difficult to treat of any one of the Commandments adequately in a single sermon, it is most of all difficult to deal adequately with this. We can only pray that God will enable us to learn some fragments of the Divine teaching which He meant it to convey to us.

Observe, first, that this is a unique commandment. Search all the laws of all the world and you will not find one which resembles it. The Sixth, the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth you will find in all codes, though only as prohibitions of crimes which are amenable to human justice, and not as heart-searching rules of self-examination which Christ meant them to be. The Tenth Commandment is the complement of all the rest; it shows that God requires of us not only outward virtue, but inward holiness, that He demands in us sacrifice of the will, from which wicked actions spring, that sinful imaginations are a crime against Him, as well as wicked acts. Human laws can only prohibit crimes of which human eyes can take cognisance; the hearts of men are beyond their reach. The tyrant can only command the outward obedience of his slave, but he cannot subdue the fierce rebellion which rages in that slave's heart; he cannot hush the unspoken curses which blight him with the white lightning of their heat. He makes no attempt to order what he is impotent to enforce. The heart of fallen man is only the chamber of unclean imagery, like that which horrified the prophet Ezekiel when in the house of God his eye surveyed the dark idolatries of alienated Judah; but it is shrouded in impenetrable darkness, it is the hidden knowledge, the mysterious depths of that individuality which in each of us is an island surrounded by an unvoyageable sea. None can enter, none can even approach the heart, but that Divine Legislator who would fain transform it from a haunt of devils into a sanctuary of God. The unique command which prohibits not only commissions but concupiscence can be uttered by God alone. And herein the ten commands on Sinai anticipated the eight beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount. The law says: "Thou shalt not desire"; the Gospel says: "Blessed are the pure in heart." And from this Divine statute we see one marked by Divine wisdom and supreme tenderness, it is a commandment pre-eminently spiritual, it cuts at the root of all formalism and of hypocrisy, it shows us that each man is not what he seems to be to men, but what he is in the eyes of God. The lesson which the Tenth Commandment teaches us is that God must be obeyed, not with eye service as men pleasers but with singleness of heart. "As he thinketh," says Solomon of the dissembler, "so he is." Priests often lead men to be content with the cleansing of the outside of the cup and the platter, yet the Law with its demands for human sincerity might have taught them that all outward formalities are an abomination to God, if they be offered as substitutes for justice, humility and love. Even the heathen say that the God with whom we have to do is one with whom nothing avails except heart obedience. "Wickedness and injustice," says Aristotle, "lie in the intention." "He," says Juvenal, "who thinks in silent wickedness within himself incurs the guilt of the deed."

And this command is tender as well as unique, for it is designed to save us from error; it is meant not to terrify us but to train; it reveals to us as with a flash out of God's eternity when and how the work of our life has to be done; it says to us, as the prophet Jeremiah said to Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, wash thine heart from wickedness that thou mayest be saved. How long shall thy vain thoughts lodge within thee?" It says unto Solomon, "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." Ah, there is the difficulty. It is quite easy to be outwardly respectable, most of us are at least that; it is easy to keep the letter of the Commandments, but to obey with all our heart, with all our mind, with all our soul, with all our strength, to keep the law in its entirety without reservation for one darling idol, one besetting or bosom sin, to always keep it in wilful boyhood, in fretful youth, in tempted manhood, and in disillusioned age—which of us is thus an upright man and perfect? Still, alas, is this possible when we have not been faithful in the past? Now this commandment shows us that there is no sound cure for any disease without the removal of the cause. Can a polluted fountain send forth sweet waters? Are good fruits borne from a corrupt tree? Ah, my brethren, the salt must be flung into the bubbling spring or the stream will be full of death, and the roots of the corrupt tree must be taken up, not merely its buds nipped or even its branches lopped. To leave off old sins is something, and even much, but it is not enough. We must not only stop sinning but stop desiring to sin. If we would still like to sin we are not regenerate; we must die to sin. This is what St. Paul meant when, haunted by the agonies of personal experience, he says over and over again that we must have the true circumcision of the heart, that we

must crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts, that we must mortify the deeds of the body, mortify our members that are upon the earth, evil desire and covetousness, which is idolatry; for because of these things the wrath of God is ever arriving upon the sins of disobedience. It is this concupiscence, this evil impulse, which must be hushed within us by the Spirit of Christ. The lust of the flesh, thoughts of our bodily appetites, the lust of the eyes, the vain desires and passions of the mind, the braggart vaunt of wealth, our mammon worship, our selfishness, our arrogant vain ambition—these we must derascinate. It is at the root of these that the axe of this Commandment is uplifted, until they are hewn down and cast into the fire; Moses as well as Christ will teach us that we are not converted and we shall not be safe.

THE MOTHER OF ALL SINS.—"Thou shalt not covet." The literal meaning of the Commandment is, "Thou shalt not excessively or wrongfully, thou shalt not unlawfully or irregularly, desire anything which thou canst not innocently and uprightly possess." Perhaps you think, "What harm can a mere desire do when I have not even expressed it? What wrong can there be in such an airy nothing, such an impalpable thought?" The answer is twofold. First that airy nothing, that impalpable thought as you call it, is a very real thing: it is seen in heaven, it is heard in heaven, in heaven it needs forgiveness, and consequently that thought will, if dwelt upon, be certainly the prolific mother of all sins; it is the cockatrice's egg which brings forth the offspring of the fiery flying serpent. Guilty longings are the avant-couriers of the performance of guilty lusts concealed in the guise of a harmless infant, he guilty curiosity, the guilty lingering on the confines of temptation; the guilty wish pushes open the wicket gate, and then when it has done so it springs into the menancing stature of a giant demon. What great harm you say is there in a mere guilty look, a mere guilty wish, a mere guilty longing if it stops there? Well, are they so harmless if they stop there? Do they stop there? The guilty look of David at Bathsheba from his palace roof, the guilty longing of Achan for the ingot of gold, the guilty desire of Ahab for Naboth's vineyards: did nothing come of them? In the first case the bad desire led to idolatry, in the second it led to theft, and in the third it led to murder. The sole way to keep ourselves from the infinite possibility of sin is only to follow the exhortation of St. James: "Cleanse your hearts, ye sinners, purify your hearts, ye double-minded." It is with the latter form of concupiscence, with the covetousness which is idolatry, that the extension of the Commandment chiefly deals. It warns us against the greed of accumulation and the thirst for gold. Is it not an awful thought that besides all the other mass of sin which the desire for money is constantly causing among mankind, even the Apostle could be perverted by the love of gain? And have we not the fearful proofs in every generation that the love of money is still the root of all men's evil? Does it not make the heart bleed to think of women rich in a good man's love, of men high in reputation, and besides, of students eminent in attainments, who even in these few last months have also been dragged by the lust of ill-gotten gain into the unspeakable misery and mire? And do not nations also find the lesson, does not England find it? Is there no fear that avarice, the counter selfishness of capital and of labour, should fall like the star wormwood of the Apocalypse and poison all her streams with deathful bitterness? Is there no fear of cut-throat competition from selfish luxury in one class and raging envy in another? Was not this the utter curse and the blighting ruin of mediæval Spain? Did not Cortez say to Montezuma: "Send us gold, for we Spaniards have a disease of the heart that can only be cured by gold." "Since first the dominion of man was asserted over the ocean"—with these words a celebrated book begins—"three thrones beyond all others have been set upon its sands; the thrones of Tyre, of Venice, and of England. Of the first of these great Powers only the memory remains, of the second ruin, the third, which inherits their greatness, if it forgets their example, may be led to brighter eminence to less pitied destruction." This Commandment says to our England of to-day, "Which wilt thou be, the freeman of Christ or the bond slave of mammon? Which wilt thou be, the protector of the helpless or its destroyer? Which wilt thou be, an example to the world or its corrupter? Which wilt thou be, the evangelist of the world, or its beast of burden? Rich thou art beyond all nations and art ever becoming more and more rich. But wealth means weal, means well-being, it does not mean riches, and woe to thy weal if the Pactolus of thy riches lose itself in the Phlegethon of drink or in the scum and sludge of selfish accumulations. If so, thy glory, as the great statesman said, "shall fade like the Tyrian dye, and moulder like the Venetian palace." And to myriads of Englishmen at this moment who tossed with the mad intoxication of an insatiable greed, sell honour, honesty, uprightness, peace, to get rich, bartering with the Eternal God, to them the Tenth Commandment says: "Try to be rich to God, godliness is a great gain," if a man be content with that he will be secure. "Take heed," said Jesus, "and beware, for man's life consisteth not in the multitude of the things that he possesseth." But this Commandment teaches us something more than contentment, lovely, indeed, and full of happiness as a virtue.

THE CURSE OF COVETOUSNESS.—Utter content is but the passive form of the most fruitful of all virtues, it is self-sacrifice, but he who has ceased to desire will rejoice also to abstain; he who desires to cease that selfish greediness for what does not

belong to him, or what he ought largely to share with others will be eager to give with wise generosity, he will find that herein is happiness. St. Edmund of Canterbury, one of our sweet English saints, used to leave his money on the sill of the window of his staircase for any one to take who would, and sometimes he would sprinkle dust over it, saying, "Ashes to ashes, dust to dust." Another great man said, "We have no time to get rich, the expulsive power of good ambitions leaves no time for meaner passions." The lives of such saints poured silent contempt on gold, and how great is their reward! They are uplifted above the base temptations which surround the toiling, moiling multitude. St. Paul calls the Fifth Commandment the first commandment that promises, but though the promise is unexpressed every Commandment is a commandment with the richest promise, every obedience is accompanied by its immense beatitude. Love taught us by the Sixth has bliss; purity taught us by the Seventh has heavenliness; honesty taught us by the Eighth has confidence; the mastery of the tongue taught us by the Ninth has perfection; and this Tenth Commandment, whilst being the root of all the others, combines all the others' blessedness. Self-abnegation, the subdual of concupiscence, means that the soul is satisfied with God. Dissatisfaction is the necessary curse of worldly life. "Vanity of vanity," says one of the best known novels of the century, "which of us has what he desires, and having it is satisfied? Answer me, children of the world, votaries of self-indulgence, slaves of gold, answer me and confess your misery. Can you have your souls in this heap of mud, are you such poor mean beings that it is a sufficient end of life for you to have a good balance at your banker's? Or have not you too heard the sound of harpy wings over your ledgers and your gold? Those harpies are the ghosts of vicious, fretful, lawless passions, the vain, meagre spirits of wasted energy and the unappeased flames of unsatisfied hope." Contrast with this the peace of him whose passions are subdued, and whose heart is given to God. God gives him exactly what the world cannot give—perfect satisfaction. The picture of the world is "Wickedness shall burn like fire, no man shall spare his brother, he shall snatch on the right hand, and be hungry, and he shall eat on the left hand and not be satisfied; but the good man is satisfied from himself, the meek shall eat and be satisfied, they shall be satisfied with the goodness of God's house, God shall give them drink of His pleasure as out of a river." Covetousness means a curse, but he who gives all to Christ gains all from Christ; he who will lose his life for Christ's sake shall always find it. Can you imagine a more struggling and apparently miserable lot than that of some poor harmless missionary in the depths of Africa? Not long ago a dying missionary wrote home from the wilds of Africa: "Tell my family and all my friends that I rejoice to have left all for Christ. Were my sacrifice to make again, I think as I lie here dying in a strange land I would make it again a thousand times, I would not change my lot for all the happiness of the world."

The Awakening of Conscience.—And lastly, since this Commandment is thus deep and broad, it is not strange that it should have wrought most memorable effects in the spiritual history of mankind. It brought to two men convictions which have changed the conditions of the world and of the Church. It made St. Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles, it made Luther the herald of the Reformation. You heard what St. Paul says in the lesson which was read to you. He tells us there that the day had been when he felt no sense of sin. Sin was dormant in him; it lay like a torpid snake amid the flowers of his self-satisfaction; he was unconscious of resistance to God and alienation from God, but this Commandmant: "Thou shalt not covet, thou shalt not desire" detected and evoked the sin within him. He saw that his accurate legality was the whitewash of the grave; he saw even his persecuting zeal was nothing better than arrogant and passionate selfishness, and thus in the death of sin Christ found him and made him alive unto God. Paul, the furious persecutor, was changed by the conviction brought by this Commandment into the Paul the loving evangelist; Saul, the hated Pharisee, was changed into Paul the holy apostle. No less mighty was the work it wrought for Martin Luther. It has been sometimes the case that the Church, the visible Church, has sunk into concupiscence and covetousness. Multitudes of priests in Luther's day had turned atheists as did Elias' sons, who filled the house of God with lust and violence. The Inquisition, founded in Spain by the most execrable of Popes, made heaven black with the smoke of burning saints. Their pomp, their pride, their lies, their lecheries, their murders, their arrogant self-assertion, their insatiable thirst for gold stank in the nostrils of mankind, whilst all the time they professed to hold in their exclusive polluted hands the keys even of hell. In the city of Rome dwelt a man who called himself the Vicar of Christ. From this man it went forth to all the people of Europe that remission of sins could be bought at the price of money to be used for the building of a church. To Pope Leo X., that liveliest of jokers, this seemed as reasonable a way of raising funds for the Church as any other. To one man, however, this was not a jest but an abomination and a blasphemy. One man, when the offer of absolution was being sold by the priests, thundered in their ears, and in the ears of the nations of Europe, "Thy money perish with thee." The concupiscence, the covetousness, the evil desire of his own heart, had been revealed to him by God, who condemns it. He had found that, alike for peasants, such as he was, and for

scholars, such as he had become, there is deliverance from concupiscence in union with God, in Him who gave Himself up for the world. The covetousness of the Church witnessed by Christ's self-sacrifice utterly appalled Martin Luther. It meant to him nothing but this, that the Church was denying Christ, was selling herself to His enemy, and this voice, coming from a monk knowing only the cloister and the college, produced such a national movement as neither kings nor priests could quell, for men knew in their inmost hearts that covetousness was eating up Christendom, that kings were enslaved to it, and that priests were cherishing it, and that no maxim of ethics, no ridicule of wits and no insurrection of peasants could put it down, and that only in the name of God could it be encountered, only God could raise His Church out of the pit that His ministers had been digging for it. The law which forbids concupiscence led Luther as St. Paul to Christ. "This German beast," said Leo X., "cares nothing for gold"; a strange phenomena when all the priests and all the world cared so much for gold: but because Luther did not care for gold, and lived and died a very poor man, it raised the hearts of myriads of men to seek their treasure, where he had done, in things above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. Ah! may we learn the lesson as a nation and a Church, and in our individual hearts say only, "Can we be delivered from the self-will, which in a nation shows itself in social godlessness, in deep seated corruption, in idolatry, in lies and fraud?" In a Church self-will is manifested by partizanship and subterranean intrigues, in a society it creates an atmosphere of gossip, scandal and spite; in each individual heart this self-will is a source of overflowing egotism, of claims of exaggerated self-importance, an abject passion or admiration of self. Only Christ can deliver us; and the end of all Commandments, and of this Commandment most of all, is Christ. The Commandments in our English service are most happily linked with the communion. We cannot have the joy of one without obedience to the other. If we lose the commandment to the nation we lose the Gospel to mankind. When the law has taught us to embrace the Gospel, the Gospel enables us to fulfil the law. It turns a deathful letter into the promise of life, it turns the fire of Sinai into the dew of Hermon, and Moses and Elias are side by side with our transfigured Lord. Covetousness springs from perverted self—the death of self is the life of Christ within us. But we cannot by our own power slay self. The law first evokes in us the resistance to a holy will, and then convinces us of our guilt; then shows us our own utter helplessness, and, last of all, drives us helpless and self-condemned to the feet of Christ our Lord, to ask there with tears of penitence for His freely-given grace, and to find our sole hope and help, to find our very life and light in Him first, Him last, Him most, and without end.

OUR NEIGHBOUR'S FAULTS.

By Rev. RICHARD W. HILEY, D.D., Principal of Thorporch Grange School, and Vicar of Wighill, Yorks.

Sermon Preached at Wighill.

"Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and behold a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."—Matthew vii. 3-5.

YOU will recognise at once where these words are taken from. They come from the best sermon that was ever preached. That is, indeed, not much to say, when we consider that it was preached by Him Who was the source of wisdom, Who called Himself the Truth, and Whom men saw at once, and confessed to be, no common teacher, but a Teacher sent from God. Now, amongst other names by which our blessed Lord was spoken of in Scripture before He came, there was this, that He should be called the Prince of Peace. He came to make peace between sinful men and God the Father, Who hates sin, but in the midst of it loves the sinner still. He came also to make men at peace with each other. Instead of being full of envyings, burnings, jealousies, and such like, He sought to make them at one with Himself and at one with each other. With this in view He gave them a new commandment, that they should love each other. He called men His friends. If He saw a storm at sea He said, "Peace be still"; if He saw a man torn by an evil spirit it was the same Voice that called the sufferer to be still and peaceable and in his right mind. Jesus, then, loved peace and harmony. The heaven that He had quitted was the abode of peace and harmony. He wished to make the earth the same. This will explain why so much is said, in this Sermon on the Mount, about peace and love and goodwill, and all those habits and vices which prevent or destroy them. The world was to be, and is, His Kingdom, and He will some day come and claim it But it will not be fit for Him till the whole world is a "Society of Friends," and He is the Common Friend of us all. The world is His family, for which He was content to be betrayed, but it will not be the family which He yearns to see till all men are become brothers, and He is the elder brother, around whom the younger ones crowd. Of the passages in the Sermon on the Mount that are of this peace-loving and peace-making character, the verses which I have read form one. They are so simple that it might be said that

a child can understand them without explanation. Exactly. For that very reason they need exposition, lest from their apparent simplicity they escape attention. Jesus dwelt with His Father before He came amongst men. That men might feel fully sure that He understood their hearts and ways, that they might get confidence to trust in Him, He came and lived amongst them like a working man. He lived in the house of Joseph, His reputed father, He went about dressed like a working man, worked at His trade, would go out to His work or do it at home as His business called Him, He would pass His evenings after His work was over with His family, He would hear plans of livelihood discussed. His brothers and sisters—for we have good reason for believing that He had some—would talk as young men and women do talk after working hours are over. Neighbours would drop in, and He would hear their talk. He might very likely return their visits, join their meals, walk out with them on fine evenings, and have all that intercourse that passes between neighbours.

The Habit of Back-biting.—At the time He is now speaking He is thirty-three years of age, and, therefore, supposing Jesus of Nazareth had been only a man, He was quite competent to speak as a man of experience. He knew what men did and said, because He had seen and heard it as a man. He was competent to advise about it and reprove it, because He was more than a man. Now one thing Jesus Christ had observed in this life of seclusion before his ministry was this: that when men and women meet together their talk is much about their neighbours. Of course this cannot be helped, and to some extent it is right. We live in a society, and must feel interest in each other. We should not be human beings if we did not. But the Christ observed that when the neighbour was passed in review, it was not his virtues that men talked about; they were not thinking how it might be possible to do him a kindness, but it was just the opposite. If the poor man had a bodily misfortune, perhaps it was laughed at. If he had some fault in his character, this was talked of over and over again, as if it was a splendid piece of music that one never tired of hearing. If he had a misfortune in his business, instead of being sorry for him, the calamity seemed to give them pleasure —"Serve him right!" "I said it would be so"—as if it were a delight to see one in pain, a delight to tell of misfortune coming on a man.

It is this habit and this style of talk that our blessed Lord had observed and refers to here. Wherever men and women come together there is the same inclination, the same thing going on, except they have been taught differently. But because it was just the opposite to what He wanted to see, because if this spirit were ever encouraged, men would never become friends and brothers, the Christ taught us differently in this sermon. To do this the great Teacher first teaches us that such judging our neighbours is wrong. It is wrong because, in the first place, we are often worse ourselves. Christ says, "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, and behold there is a beam in thine own eye." A mote is a small speck; those small specks that we see in a ray of light from a sunbeam. A beam is, of course, a log of wood. The Master says, that all the time that you are looking at this very, very small fault of your neighbour's, this small speck of dust, you have a fault of your own as huge as a lump of wood. How can this be? In this way. We know very well that in every action it is not so much what we actually do as the reason for doing it, that makes all the difference. The poor widow who threw mites into the treasury was considered as having cast in more than the rich men who cast in their gold pieces. The great Teacher did not mean by that to say that two farthings were more than a gold piece, but it cost her more to part with them, and it was this motive that made her action the greater. If then it is the motive that makes the worth of an action, how can we tell our neighbour's motive? We see him do an action, and we may find fault with him, and call it bad. Perhaps if we knew why he did it, we should find that he was right, that he had the best intentions.

Unseen Virtues.—To give an instance which the preacher knows to be an actual fact: A merchant of his acquaintance was thought to be very selfish with his money. He was known to be very rich, and lived something like a rich man; yet when asked for subscriptions he gave always a small sum—he gave £5 when his neighbours thought he ought to give £20. He was, therefore, very selfish and miserly, and bore a nickname in consequence. Everybody was looking at this mote which seemed like a beam. This went on for years, and he was generally disliked. One of his neighbours, who respected him on all other points, was determined to bottom the matter. He learnt with difficulty, and after careful inquiry, that during all these years this much-abused man was supporting handsomely a large family of poor relatives. He educated them well, and put them out in life with no niggard hand. They lived in another place, no one, not even his intimate friends, knew; he never spoke of it; but he did it for years.

The same inquirer found, too, that if a real case of benevolence was put before this rich man, and he were told reasonably what he ought to give, the rich man often gave it. So here was a man whom all men were abusing, because they did not know enough about him. They saw him give only small sums, but did not know the motive; whereas he was just one of those really benevolent men that the blessed Saviour would love to see. Now suppose one of these neighbours had had his own action examined. We will suppose the neighbour

to have been giving large sums to subscriptions, and been very proud of it. But he did it to be thought well of—to be talked about. Is that real benevolence? It is just such a case as the Saviour would spurn. He would say to this latter man: "You are trying to persuade men that you are benevolent, and you are not. You are a hard man to those about you, but are full of pride and hypocrisy, and this your gift is not meant by you as a gift, it is meant as a bribe to buy a certain reputation." Now here is a case which shows how possible it is to be worse ourselves, and so it points out the wrong of looking out for our neighbour's faults. The fault-finder was worse himself; he was looking at what appeared a small fault in his neighbour, and he had a greater one of his own: his neighbour's was only a speck of dust, and his own is as huge as a beam of timber.

The Saviour gives us another reason why sitting in judgment on our neighbours and their sayings and doings is wrong. We are not only often worse ourselves, but we do it from a wrong motive. If we saw our neighbour's fault and grieve over it because all sin is grievous in our eyes, because it is an offence against God and we do not like to have Him offended, then there might be some excuse. There might be some excuse, too, if we grieved because our neighbour will suffer harm in consequence in the long run, and we don't want him to suffer harm. But this is not our motive. It is not that we hate sin, for were he proved to be innocent of that we should try to find something else. It is not that we love our neighbour, for who ever shows love to a friend by making his character as black as possible? It arises often from ill-nature. Some people have born in them the love of doing harm; put before them a way of doing a man a good turn and a way of doing him an evil one, and they will rather not stir themselves to oblige. It arises often from envy. We feel that a man is better than ourselves; we know it; we see that others esteem him more. We then long to bring him down. Instead of lifting ourselves up to his purity we try to bespatter his character with mud. Our conduct arises often from jealousy. We are struggling to get the respect of our neighbours and rise in the world; our neighbour is struggling too, and we are not generous enough to wish a rival God-speed, and thus in our jealousy we would deprive him of his fair character. For all these cases there is a vile motive, and so our action is bad and detestable in the sight of God. We are professing to point out our neighbour's fault as if we scorned it, and we don't scorn it; we are hypocrites; we are rather pleased that he has a fault to gaze on; and we stand staring at and turning it over, and magnifying it, and the sight gives us positive pleasure.

For these two great reasons does our blessed Lord warn us against sitting in judgment against our neighbour's faults. He shows us why it is wrong to do so, because we do it from a wrong motive; we profess to hate his sin, and we are playing the hypocrite, we don't hate it; and we have all the time a worse fault ourselves. The blessed Master bids us cease doing this. Away with such bickering and envy and jealousy. The Redeemer wants happiness and love amongst men. He wants a family united in love, and would see everything that is affectionate and charitable and kind.

Self-Criticism.—Up to this we have been told what not to do; the Master then goes on to teach us what we are to do. First, says the Christ, "pluck out the beam out of thine own eye." He bids each man to look at himself, to examine his own conduct; if he sees anything amiss in his neighbour, just to observe whether the same fault is not in his own bosom. We have a good instance of this in the New Testament. You will remember, at the Lord's Supper, the blessed Lord said to His disciples, "One of you shall betray Me." "What! shall one of us be a traitor to his Friend? Who can it be?" They are silent for a time. Each man looks into his own heart; can I be capable of such a crime? He is thinking not about his neighbour, but himself. Then each asks Christ, "Lord, is it I?" John does not say, "Lord, will Peter do it, or Andrew?" Each says, "Lord, is it I?" That is what the Christ means us to do, each man to pluck out his own beam. We shall find that enough to do. A besetting sin is not got over in a day, nor in a week. It will not be got over by once looking after, or by once thinking of. It will need all our watchfulness and all our care, and we shall find little time for watching that of our neighbour. When thou hast done this, Christ says, thou shalt see clearly to pull out the mote from thy brother's eye. Thou shalt see clearly; for thou shalt then know whether it is a fault or not. You will have got into the habit of making allowances; of thinking there may be some good motives in your neighbour's mind which at present you do not know. Before I charge him with a fault I will be quite sure, make all inquiries, and ask him whether he meant to do what is said of him. By seeing clearly in this way, the fault will be found to be much smaller. Thou shalt see clearly. Yes, for thou wilt do it kindly. Instead of rushing in haste to attack my neighbour for a sin, I shall remember the grief of my own sin; how much it pained me; with how much difficulty I got the better of it; the long struggle it was; have I got the better of it now? Now my neighbour may be struggling in the same way, all this time that he is getting abused. He may know his fault, and may be striving hard against it too. I will see clearly and speak to him kindly, and tell him of his fault in such a way as I should like to be told of mine. Thou shalt see clearly. Yes, having tried against my own, I will give my neighbour the benefit of my assistance, of my experience.

I will tell him how I struggled against my fault; what remedies I took to recover from the disease of sin; I will soothe him in his sickness; help him in the fight, and rejoice when he has pulled out the mote from his eye.

Brethren, let us deal thus with our own faults, and so with our neighbours, and we shall find the truth of the Psalmist's word, "How good and joyful a thing it is to dwell together in unity."

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1892.

NEWSPAPER ETHICS.

WE much regret a couple of accidents which occurred in the printing of our last week's editorial. By some mischance what should have been a separate paragraph about the "Reformed Church" at Southend (most people will agree that that particular church certainly wants reforming) was printed as a continuation of the article on the Cambridge Proctorial case. The title of the paragraph, had it not been mislaid, would have prevented the mistake, which we lament that the wording of the article tended to intensify, the offending ministers belonged to the Church of England. On the contrary, they belong to a peculiar body, which styles itself, save the mark, the "Reformed Church of England," and the paragraph should have been so headed.

The need of this apology reminds us of certain questions of newspaper ethics. We observe that the account of this particular brawl was carefully produced in the *Daily Chronicle* as taking place among members of the Church of England. The report was evidently furnished by an eye-witness, who was presumably acquainted with the nature of the church and the ministers, but this knowledge the *Daily Chronicle* did not allow to transpire. Perhaps it was accidental, though we can hardly believe it; but the fact remains that, in spite of the prominence given to the account, which was about one column and a quarter, and the circumstantiality of the detail, there was no hint given that the brawlers were members of an obscure schism, but rather the reverse, and no correction has ever been made since. It is of a piece with a rather older case concerning the same schismatics, when certain newspapers freely advertised the remarkable proceedings of a self-styled "bishop"—obviously trading upon the title, though they were quite aware of the real facts. The Church of England knows its enemies and can face them, but this warfare of slander and insinuation is as mean and miserable as it is, fortunately, harmless.

But this habit of spreading insinuations and refusing to admit corrections is a growing one. We have seen it in the Hopkins' case at Cambridge, and in the case of the Tring murderers. We feared that it was too much to expect the newspapers who had championed the woman Hopkins to confess their error, and a valued correspondent again calls attention to the *Daily Chronicle* in this connection. He is quite right; the manner in which the *Daily Chronicle* reported the trial Hopkins *v.* Wallis, the ingenious insinuation that the evidence and verdict were alike purely formal, and the brilliant suggestion that a defendant who won a verdict positively on the nature of the evidence against him, as miserable as it was, abstained from calling witnesses because he had none to call, all form a melancholy instance of most deliberate partisan perversion and suppression and distortion of truth. It is a clear case of persistent sinning against light and reason rather than admit an error and correct a prejudice. So with the Tring murderers. In the heat of its animus the *Daily Chronicle* involved in its denunciations even the unconscious owner of the land on which the murders occurred—a man so generous that he was at that moment assisting the families of the murderers, and so sensitive that he had actually sacrificed his preserves to prevent the possibility of future calamities. When the real facts were pointed out one would think no apology would be sufficient. This precious newspaper made none at all, and grudgingly printed a short letter disproving all its statements, with a comment which showed no signs of repentance. Let us close an ungracious task, only adding that in its arguments for the Tring murderers the *Daily Chronicle* was proved to have misrepresented their condition, and to have altered the well-known facts of a case it quoted as a precedent on their behalf. What are we to think of such behaviour? The Press is a great power, but let journalists remember that their power is not intrinsic; it comes from the confidence which the public will put in them as long as they find it warranted. It will not long be continued to journals which even in small things abuse their position to suppress truth and disseminate error. In spite of these unsavoury instances we hope the day is yet far distant when from prejudice and partiality, not to say worse, the English Press as a whole shall sink to the very unedifying level of the bulk of foreign journals.

ST. ASAPH Diocesan Conference will be held at Bala on September 6th and 7th.

THE BOOK OF ARMAGH.

By the late Right Rev. WILLIAM REEVES, D.D., LL.D., M.B., President of the Royal Irish Academy, Hon. Mem. Soc. Antiq., Scot. and Zurich, Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore.

(*Continued from page* 166.)

In St. John's Gospel the vellum is finer and the writing more delicate than in the preceding ones, exquisite as their execution is. And it is remarkable that this tribute of honour to the loved disciple, or *Owen na bruinne*, that is, "John of the bosom," as the Irish anciently designated him, is not peculiar to this manuscript, but is observable in others still preserved.

After the Gospels follow St. Paul's Epistles, to which are prefixed, generally and individually, arguments or prefaces, chiefly from the pen of Pelagius. Between Colossians and 1 Timothy is inserted the Epistle to the Laodiceans, a spurious composition, which, at an early age of the Church, was forged by some enthusiast, who supposed, from Colossians iv. 16, that such an epistle once existed, and therefore should be supplied to make good a deficiency This epistle is found in a great variety of Latin manuscripts of the New Testament, and has even made its way into some early printed Bibles.

In the First Epistle of St. John, the famous passage concerning the Witnesses, which, in our Testaments, is the 7th verse of the fifth chapter, is in this manuscript entirely omitted, as it is also in the oldest copy of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. What is our 8th verse succeeds immediately to the 6th, and commences: "For there are three that bear witness in earth," etc.

The Apocalypse succeeds the Catholic Epistles, and, instead of closing the New Testament, is followed by the Acts of the Apostles. This order is very remarkable, and is peculiar to this manuscript. Speaking of order, it may be observed, that in some very ancient manuscripts of the Latin Testament the Evangelists are placed in this sequence: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, in which position they appear in the oldest Irish copy of the Gospels which is known, namely, that numbered A. 4. 15, in the manuscript library of Trinity College, Dublin.

After the close of the inspired portion of the Book of Armagh, succeeds the Life of St. Martin of Tours, written by Sulpicius Severus, and which is introduced into this volume partly in connection with St. Patrick's history, who was believed to have been a nephew of that distinguished ecclesiastic, and partly because of the veneration in which St. Martin was held in the ancient Church of Ireland. The closing article in the book is a short litany or intercession on the writer's behalf.

The preceding is a brief statement of the contents of this inestimable volume. We shall now give an outline of its history, concerning which more is probably known than of any other manuscript of like age in the world.

It was written, as has been observed, about the year 807, that is, about three centuries after St. Patrick's decease. Now, among the native Irish this book was generally believed to have been the work of the saint himself; and, accordingly, the name by which it was commonly known was *Canoin Phadraig*, or, "the Scripture of Patrick." At first it was, of course, only received in the church of Armagh, for which it was written, as a recent but beautiful transcript, in part possibly of St. Patrick's autograph, and collection of biblical and literary matter; but in process of time, when the age of discrimination was past, and the public mind was prepared to receive an exaggerated story of its antiquity and authority, it was passed off as having been written by St. Patrick's own hand, and Ferdomnach, the real scribe's name, was, wherever it occurred, in a great measure effaced. By degrees the book rose so much in favour that in 937, we are told by the Four Masters, "The Canon of Patrick was encased by Donough, son of Flann, king of Ireland." Possibly they may have reference to the remarkable leather satchel which accompanies it, and which bears the marks of great antiquity; so much so, that it is considered by a high authority to be of that early date. In the year 1004 it was in such high esteem at Armagh, that it was selected to receive the record of King Brian Boru's donation to the See, just as the Book of Kells was chosen in 1853 to be the depository of the Queen and Prince Albert's autographs on the occasion of their visiting Trinity College. It was the custom in the old monasteries to enter charters in the margins or blank pages of their most valued manuscripts as the best mode of securing the preservation of these documents. So it is in the Book of Kells, in Ireland; the Book of Llandaff, in Wales; Cuthbert's Gospels, in England; and the Book of Deir, in Scotland. Brian Boru, the first sovereign of Ireland who was not of the royal stock of the North, became king in 1001. In the year 1004 he made a royal progress through Ireland, and having arrived at Armagh, remained in that town for a week. While there, he presented a golden ring of twenty ounces as an offering on the high altar of the church. In 1006 he again visited Armagh, and received the homage of the King of Ulster. On the former of these occasions it probably was that he ratified to the church of Armagh its ancient privileges, as expressed in the brief entry which appears in our manuscript, on the reverse of folio 16, and in a hand which, though old, is much more modern than that in which the substance of the volume is written. The following is a translation of it:—"St. Patrick, when going to heaven, ordained that the entire produce of his labour, as well as of baptism, and decisions as of alms, was to be delivered to the apostolic city, which in the Scotic tongue is called Arddmacha. Thus I have found it [stated] in the records of the Scots. This is my writing, namely, *Calvus Perennis*, in the presence of Brian, sovereign of the Scots; and what I have written he decreed for all the kings of *Maceria*."

In this curious record, which confirmed to Armagh the ecclesiastical supremacy of Ireland, there is a total absence of the legal formalities which afterwards came in with the Anglo-Norman settlement; and it is quite in keeping with the style of the Celtic memoranda which are preserved in a few ancient manuscripts elsewhere. *Calvus Perennis* is the literal translation into Latin of the well-known Irish name Maolsuthain, pronounced Mulsoohan. The individual of the name who wrote this was the private confessor of the king, and, as might be expected, accompanied him in his expeditions. He died in the year 1032, and the record of his decease is entered, at that year, in the Annals of the Four Masters, in these words: "Maolsuthain anmchara (or 'soul-friend') of Brian, son of Cennedy, departed this life." In like manner, the word *Maceria* is the Latin equivalent for the Irish "Cashel," of which the southern princes were kings; on this occasion re-

presented by Brian Boru, in his own name and that of his successors. Brian fell at Clontarf in 1014, but the royal sanction which he gave to the claims of Armagh, no doubt, conferred additional importance on this See, and greatly enhanced the value of the book in which it was entered. In 1134, when Nigellus was compelled by Malachi Omorgair to retire from Armagh, he took with him this book, and the famous crozier called "the Staff of Jesus," which were regarded as the title-deeds of the primacy; and in virtue of which, coupled with his ecclesiastical descent he was enabled after two years to return and resume his official position. This we learn from St. Bernard's Memoir of Malachi, who, in reference to this very book, states, on the authority of his Irish informant, that certain insignia of that church, namely, "the text of the Gospels, which belonged to the blessed Patrick, and the staff covered over with gold, and adorned with the most precious gems, were generally known and in great repute among the natives, and were held in such reverence by all, that the silly and ignorant multitude acknowledged him as bishop, in whose possession they might be seen."

It was customary, also, as it has been in the case of other reliquaries down to the present day, to administer oaths on very solemn occasions upon this book, and the individual who was so sworn was regarded as taking an obligation of an awfully binding nature. He who, under the circumstances, forswore himself, or afterwards broke a promise ratified upon it, was said "to violate the Canon of Patrick," and was considered amenable to the vengeance of the insulted Saint, which was sure to fall upon him in the form of a sudden visitation in body or estate. Of this we have an instance in the Annals of the year 1179, where the Four Masters relate that "O'Rogan, Lord of Iveagh, died of a three nights' sickness after he had been expelled from his dominions, for violating the Canon of Patrick." In fact, the secular arm was authorised to inflict immediate punishment by exile, which the invisible executive followed up with death.

To obtain forcible possession of this book, or do it a material injury, was a venial offence, for which reparation could easily be made. In 1177, when John de Courcy took Downpatrick, the Primate fell into the victor's hands, and with him, this and other sacred reliquaries of his See. The Earl of Ulster, however, behaved with greater honour than Napoleon did, when he carried the famous Greek Bible of the Vatican to Paris; for he soon after returned St. Patrick's Book to Armagh, and thus, for a season at least, escaped any unpleasant consequences, the Saint having probably been propitiated by the soldier's honesty, or gratified by the respect which he paid to his bodily relics.

Once more, towards the close of the century, we find it employed to give increased solemnity to an oath; for in 1196, "Murtagh O'Loughlin, Lord of Tyrone, was killed by Donough O'Kane, at the instigation of the Kinel-Owen, who had pledged their loyalty to him before the three shrines, and the Canon of Patrick."

From this out, Armagh continued to be the place of its custody; and there is every reason to think that, in the course of the next century, when Anglo-Normans and other strangers came, under English influence, into the See, the safe keeping of this book was committed to a native, probably a descendant of the primatial family, whose office was regarded as both honourable and important, so that the term *Maor*, or "Keeper," became, like Stuart in Scotland, or Butler in Ireland, a family designation, which gradually, with the prefix Mac, grew into a surname, and was borne by the hereditary Keeper, and the various offsets of his family.

The Keeper had also a good endowment of land in virtue of his office. It was so before 1375; for in Primate Sweteman's rental of that year, one item is:—"Out of the land of the Bearer (Bajulator) of the Canon—five shillings." Of this holding we shall presently speak. The Bajulator, or Bearer, probably carried the Book of St. Patrick in processions and on State occasions, as the Senior Proctor of Trinity College does the old Registry of the University at Commencements; and from this part of his duties derived this peculiar designation.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"THE THINKER." April, 1892. London: James Nisbet & Co.

"THE Survey of Thought" in this month's *Thinker* gives an account of a *jeu d'esprit* which has interested and amused us so much that we give it in full for the benefit of our readers. It says:—

"In the *Bibliotheca Sacra* there is a very full notice of a clever *jeu d'esprit* lately published, in which the methods so frequently made use of in Old Testament criticism are applied to the Epistle to the Romans. The fact that results similar to those obtained by some Old Testament critics can be drawn from a document, the genuineness of which is so strongly supported, shows how delusive such methods are. On analysis, the author finds that there are four well-marked divisions in the book. In one, Christ is referred to as Jesus Christ; in another, as Christ Jesus; in another, God instead of Christ is represented as the Author of salvation. This last section is divisible again into two, in one of which Christianity is represented as an ethical institution, in which salvation is by obedience to the law; while, in the other, salvation is by faith—not in Jesus, but in God. These four divisions he symbolises by the letters G^1, G^2, J C and C J. After dwelling upon the doctrinal peculiarities of these sections, the author devotes his attention to linguistic peculiarities, and brings out some astonishing results. The total number of words in the epistle, with the omission of proper names, articles, etc., is 628. Of these, G^1 uses (341 in 73 verses), 4·67 times more words than verses; G^2 (382 : 131), 2·92 more; J C (275 : 85), 3·24 more; C J (400 : 142), 2·82 more. In every respect G^1 is the most unique of the four. He uses more words in proportion to the extent of his writings, and has a large proportion of words used only by himself. G^2 and C J are, in these respects, nearly alike. J C has a larger proportion of words to verses, but has fewer words peculiar to himself. Between G^1 and G^2 there is a marked difference. Is it conceivable that one and the same writer in the first half of his work would use 4·67 times more words than verses, and in the second half only 2·92 times more? Doctrinal as well as linguistic differences can be found also in the various sections. For example, the general conception concerning the initiation of the Christian life is different in the two writers J C and C J. According to J C, it is introduced by faith in Christ on man's part (i. 17; iii. 22-26; v. 1, 2), and by

an act of gracious acquittal on God's part (iii. 21-26; v. 9-21). According to C J, however, the Christian life is begun by dying to sin, by being identified with Christ in His death to sin (vi. 2-11; vii. 6; viii. 2), and entering upon a spiritual life in Christ (vi. 11, 16; viii. 9-11, 14-17). If anything is cardinal in the so-called Pauline doctrines, it is the conceptions of faith and justification; yet with reference to these conceptions we discover a marked and unmistakable distinction between J C and C J. Their phraseology is largely different; and where it is identical, the meaning is different. The author closes with the just remark, that by the exercise of sufficient ingenuity, equally plausible results might unquestionably be made with many other ancient and even modern works about whose genuineness there is not the slightest doubt in any well-balanced mind."

The writer of this pamphlet may really have done very good work. In fact, a good deal of what Professor Cheyne and others write about the Old Testament comes so close to the absurd that ridicule is really the best answer. Did not Archbishop Whately, with solemn irony, prove by the methods of Hume that Napoleon the First never existed? Can't some one prove that there are several Professor Cheynes?

The reviews of Canon Dewer's and of Dr. Hatch's books are interesting; and many of the lesser reviews give a great deal of useful information.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FAITH AS A FACULTY.

SIR,—I suppose I must have written too hurriedly, for the part of my letter dealing with Mr. Lawrence's remarks does not seem very intelligible. The sentence, if I wrote it so, "Man believes, because of the faculty of faith being in exercise; then he loves," is very awkwardly expressed. We have the words eye, sight, seeing, and if we had parallel words we could make the meaning more intelligible. But suppose faith, belief, and believing to correspond, then all is easy. Faith is the name of the faculty; belief the name of the faculty in exercise; believing expresses the act of appropriating revealed truth. It will be seen at once that the moment the man has appropriated divine truth, he is in a state of loving, hoping, etc. I think that now what I meant to say will be quite clear, and that I need not correct further.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, March 26th, 1892.

SIR,—Mr. Sandlands is right in saying that there is more in the question of faith and its nature than has yet been brought out. But I greatly doubt if your esteemed correspondent will succeed in bringing out much if he continues to insist on his illogical use of words. He tells us that faith is not a state of being as much as love is, because a man believes owing to the faculty of faith being in exercise, and then he loves. I might as well say that a man loves because of the faculty of love being in exercise, and then he believes, which would no doubt be nonsense, and exactly the copy of what Mr. Sandlands says. The fact is, faith is not a faculty, nor is love, nor is the eye. This last I need not attempt to argue on, for a mere reference to any dictionary settles the matter. The eye is the organ of the faculty of sight; and it is not incorrect to say that faith is the organ of the spiritual faculty of man, while it is rather clumsy.

Faith has not been defined during the course of this correspondence. So as to help to a definition, may I offer a remark. Faith is not belief of a thing, but is confidence in a person. As Coleridge says, "I believe Moses and I believe Paul; but I believe *in* Christ." The constant confused translations of πίστις and πιστεύω, sometimes by faith and its like words, and sometimes by believe and its like words, are very unfortunate.

Mr. Sandlands, while plainly wrong in his reading of Ephesians ii., 8 and 9, is quite right in regarding faith as God's gift. The disciples of our Lord prayed Him to increase their faith; all Christians pray for more faith. If an increase of faith can be given, the gift can also be made when there is none at all of it.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION *VERSUS* AIONIAL PURGATORY.

SIR,—When "J. B." says he "has been reading the Bible all his life, and can say with truth that no passage has ever suggested to him extinction of being," I ask him how anything in my letter in the PULPIT of March 19th suggested to him that I held "the doctrine of annihilation or extinction of being." I only used a few expressions, which he has often read in his Bible, as describing the future punishment of the finally impenitent, such as "the vengeance of eternal fire" being "destroyed for ever," "everlasting or eternal destruction," "destruction of both body and soul in hell"; and "J. B." comes at once to the conclusion that I mean by them "extinction of being." Is it fair of him to credit me with holding that doctrine because I use those Scripture expressions, while he denies that those Scripture expressions as they occur in Holy Scripture suggest that doctrine to his mind? I did, indeed, add to them two expressions which occur in the Prayer Book, though not in the Bible, "eternal death" and "everlasting death," but he will hardly maintain that *they* imply "annihilation or extinction of being" any more than "everlasting destruction," etc. Did I use those Scripture expressions for the wrath to come, unscripturally or unfairly? If he thinks I did I shall be obliged to him if he will point that out to me.

I confess I attach very little value to such *à priori* considerations as "J. B." brings to bear against what I do hold. The question is, What is revealed as the truth of God on the subject? And the answer to that question must be gathered from Holy Scripture and from it alone.

But I would say this, if everlasting destruction of the finally impenitent does not fit in with "J. B.'s" ideas of the "great plan of Creation and Providence, as unfolded in the works and word of God," I would ask, does what I suppose he does hold as the wrath to come, viz., an existence for an eternity that will last some *æons*, or one *æon*, and then come to an end, in a state that has been truthfully, even if figuratively, described as a lake or a furnace of fire—does that, I ask, fit in with his ideas of "the great plan," etc? He allows, I suppose, that while some are so saved and

sanctified in the revealed way of salvation as that dying in the Lord, they are blessed and rest from their labours and are in joy and felicity for ever, others die in their sins and are subjected to what our Lord called eternal punishment, and St. Paul everlasting destruction, even though "saved at the length." If so he admits an inequality of treatment almost, if not quite, as great as takes place in my theory; and, I would add, a far more unreasonable treatment. I merely use this argument to show that *à priori* considerations can be brought against what he holds as well as what I hold and, I think, with far greater force.

If "J. B." writes again, as I hope he will, I shall be much obliged if he will say whether he holds "the immortality of the soul"—*i.e.*, that it is of its nature indestructible, and whether his holding that contributes in any measure to his "universal restorationism."

He objects to what he considers my view, that "the greatest defects, intellectual and moral, should be cured in some, while untold multitudes with similar defects should cease to exist." But he might just as fairly put it that I hold that "the greatest defects, etc., will be cured in untold multitudes, while some with similar defects uncured (because they could not be cured) shall cease to exist." What proportion the finally impenitent will bear to the finally saved it is not wise for us to guess or speculate about. But while I do not now say anything myself one way or other on the subject, I may say that many who hold with me that eternal destruction will be the eternal punishment of the wicked hold also that those who, as the saying is, have had no chance of salvation in this life will have it in the life to come, and that none will be eventually "destroyed for ever" but those who finally and wilfully reject Christ and His offered salvation. Not that future punishment will be a purgatory to them or to any, but that they will be so brought face to face with the light of God's grace and truth as they never have been in this life, and so that it will be seen and shown whether they are inveterate haters of the light or not.

As to what "J. B." says in his last paragraph about what the Beechers and several German writers have told us, I admit that, once the belief in universal restoration was introduced as it was by Origen in the third century, it did prevail extensively, especially in the East, till the fifth century. But I maintain that Origen originated it; that it was a very natural reaction from eternal torment; and that eternal torment originated in an unholy union between the immortality of the soul as held and taught by the Platonists and eternal punishment as taught in Holy Scripture. It may suffice at present to say in support of this that, according to Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Irenæus and Justin Martyr held the everlasting destruction of the wicked. Indeed, it is very evident from their works that they did teach it, and as no new thing. Justin was once a Platonic philosopher, and taught that the human soul, like God Himself, had no beginning, and could have no end. But the aged Christian who, as it seems, converted him to Christianity converted him also from that error, and showed him the absurdity of it. Archdeacon Farrar tells us that Jeremy Taylor himself held what he asserts Irenæus and Justin held, *in abditis fidei*. Certainly he speaks most respectfully of it.

VINDEX.

April 2nd, 1892.

THE PUBLIC AND THE PROCTORS.

SIR,—Will you allow me to criticise the cacophonous (not cacophanous, there is no such word) article on the Cambridge case in to-day's PULPIT? That case does not resolve itself into "a lawfully constituted Court trying a prisoner properly arrested under suspicious circumstances, and in the event properly convicted and sentenced." Nor has a jury decided that the Proctor "was quite right"; nor was the case for defendant so obvious that "he was content almost to prove it by the evidence called on behalf of the plaintiff"; nor was that evidence "apparently quite enough to condemn her."

The jury has found that there is nothing to directly convict defendant of bad faith in making the arrest; it has not found that he acted properly in making it. It was by defendant's evidence that the very strong suspicion of such bad faith was rebutted sufficiently to justify the jury in finding as they did; but though rebutted, not overthrown, for defendant was responsible for the act and proceeding of his constable, who got a "tip," true or false, against the unfortunate plaintiff, from a known bad character. The jury did not, and could not, try the point, which is the really important one, was the plaintiff properly convicted and sentenced. An arrest may be an error; an unjust trial was not an error, it is something worse. The woman Hopkins was tried without being allowed the assistance of a solicitor, and written evidence, that of the police book, was admitted by the Court, sworn to but not produced. This was done by a clergyman, one of a class who are of all classes the most unfit for judicial power. If a lay judge should act as he did, social infamy would be his deserved punishment.

The lesson which your writer learns from these things is, that the Cambridge Court of Morals exercises a salutary jurisdiction; and, of course, the same writer thinks that it exercises that jurisdiction properly. Most persons will judge differently, if they will only not be diverted to side issues. They will judge that a Court which refuses the aid of counsel to accused persons should not be suffered to continue to exist.

B.

April 2nd.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Acton, Rev. Edward, B.A., lately Curate of Binfield, Berks; Perpetual Curate of Hinton St. Mary, Dorset.

Adam, Rev. Henry Thompson, M.A., Curate of Calne; Vicar of Chirton, Wilts.

Barthropp, Rev. N. Shafto, M.A., Rector of Itton and Mounton, and Rural Dean; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Monmouthshire.

Betts, Rev. John Arthur, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Columba's Mission, Notting-hill; Organising Secretary to the Church House.

Brackenbury, Rev. E. B., B.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.

Brotherton, Rev. Charles Frederick, Curate-in-Charge of Crowle; Vicar of Barnetby-le-Wold, Lincolnshire.

Chamberlin, Rev. Thomas C. B., M.A., Rector of Wheatley; Rural Dean of Retford.

Clarke, Rev. Robert Douglas Léonce; Vicar of Belgrave-cum-Birstall, Leicester.

Collins, Rev. John A. Welsh, Chaplain to the Forces; Vicar of Hillfarrance, Taunton.

Corfe, Rev. E. C., M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.

Covington, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Brompton; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Worcester

Davy, Rev. T. G., Curate-in-Charge of St. Alban's, Sunninghill; Chaplain to Mr. C. D. Kemp-Welch, High Sheriff of Berkshire.
Douet, Right Rev. C. F., D.D., Assistant-Bishop of Jamaica; Rector of Mandeville, Jamaica.
Egerton, Rev. B. de M., M.A., Vicar of Brackley; Rural Dean of Brackley Third Deanery.
Gardner, Rev. James Sanders; Vicar of Kirkby-Ireleth, Carnforth.
Gardner, Rev. Walter Richard, M.A., Senior Curate at St. Helen's, Northwich; Vicar of St. Thomas's, Hyde, Cheshire.
Glover, Rev. Archibald Edward, M.A., Curate of St. Luke's, West Holloway; Rector of Sherfield, Hants.
Greenall, Rev. James, Chaplain of Leicester Prison.
Harrison, Rev. John; Rector of Waberthwaite Cumberland.
Hipkins, Rev. Edwin Charles, M.A.; Vica [of Normacott, Staffordshire.
Hughes, Rev. Frederick Llewellyn, M.A.; Rector of Lydeard St. Lawrence, Taunton.
Jeffries, Rev. Reuben; Vicar of Scothern, Lincoln.
Kirk, Rev. J. H., Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Barnsley; Vicar of South Ossett, Wakefield.
Lacon, Rev. C. H., M.A., Rector of Braunston, near Grantham; Chaplain to Mr. Joseph Paget, High Sheriff of Derbyshire.
Lang, Rev. F. C., M.A.; Chaplain to Lewes Naval Prison.
Lintolt, Rev. J. C., A.K.C.; Vicar of Rolvenden, Kent.
Longland, Rev. C. B., Curate of St. Catherine's, Higher Tranmere, Birkenhead; Missioner Chester Diocesan Special Service Missions.
Nicholl, Rev. J. R., M.A., Rector of Streatham; Honorary Canon of Rochester Cathedral.
Oakley, Rev. George R., M.A.; Curate-in-Charge of the district of St. Andrew, in the Mission district of Dearnley, in the parish of St. John's, Smallbridge, Rochdale.
Owen, Rev. Arthur Edwin Brisco, M.A.; Rector of Rodington, Shrewsbury.
Owen, Rev. Crawford Henry Hunter Wilkinson; Rector of Thorpe Constantine, Tamworth.
Paterson, Rev. Walter George, M.A. · Assistant School Inspector in the Deanery of Cary.
Pattison, Rev. John, Incumbent of Kiltallagh; Incumbent of Listowel.
Philipps, Rev. J. E., Vicar of Enstone; Chaplain to the Right Hon. Viscount Dillon.
Robinson, Rev. Thomas Arthur, M.A.; Vicar of Puxton, Somersetshire.
Ross, Rev. J. C., M.A.; Vicar of Loversal, near Doncaster.
Scriven, Rev. Rowland; Domestic Chaplain to the Archbishop of Dublin.
Slater, Rev. Walter, B.D.; Chaplain of Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford.
Sparkes, Rev. Arthur Lees, B.A.; Vicar of Worthington, Leicestershire.
Stockdale, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Worcestershire.
Thornton, Rev. F. F. M. S., Missioner for the Diocese of Ely; Rector of Downham, Cambridgeshire.
Tomson, Rev. John, B.A.; Rector of Rochford, Worcestershire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Browne, Rev. George Osborne, twenty-one years Vicar of Shireoaks, and formerly Curate of Holy Trinity, Hull, on the 29th ult., aged 59.
Edwards, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Bingley, Hon. Canon of Ripon, and Rural Dean, on the 29th ult., aged 56.
Gwyn, Rev. Richard Hamond, M.A. Oxon, for nearly thirty years Rector of South Repps, at South Repps Rectory, on the 30th ult., aged 79.
Payne, Rev. William, M.A., Hon Canon of Christ Church, Oxon, and for thirty-five years Vicar of St. John's-with-St. Stephen's, Reading, at Merton House, Reading, on the 1st inst., aged 64.
Tombs, Rev. Joseph, Rector of Burton, Pembrokeshire, and Canon of St. David's, on the 16th ult., aged 70.
Walford, Rev. William Harrison, M.A., at Speen, Newbury, on the 26th ult., aged 60.
Wilder, Rev. John Trafalgar, M.A., Rector of Great Bradley, at Great Bradley Rectory, Suffolk, on the 25th ult., aged 48.
Yelloly, Rev. John, formerly Rector of Tring, at Clare, on the 29th ult., aged 83.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CAIAPHAS—CEPHAS—JESUS.

By Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon Canon of Manchester Cathedral.

Sermon Preached on Good Friday.

"All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."—Isaiah liii. 6.

WE believe that our Saviour died as the representative of, and substitute for, sinful mankind. And all the circumstances of that death appear, when we examine them, to have been representative; and so do all the actors in the great tragedy. The forms of human sinfulness are as numerous and varied as are men's natural inclinations: but near the cross may be found a representative of every one of these. Each of us has his own sinful tendencies, differing from those of others; yet each of us can find near the cross his own representative—a sinner just like himself; so that it becomes easier to realise the fact that our own sins crucified the Saviour of the world, and that (to use the strong figure of speech of the writer to the Hebrews), our continued sins crucify Him afresh and put Him to an open shame.

I have selected for to-day one point or scene in the great tragedy. It is perhaps the most decisive one, and the most wonderful, if we consider what was done at that moment, and who were the actors in the scene. We will try to learn what sins of human nature are there represented, and so what lessons may be derived for our times and for our own personal lives.

Three figures will demand our attention—Caiaphas, the High Priest, with his surroundings; and then, amidst the obscurity of the twilight scene, and the crowd of spectators, we must single out the figure of Simon, then at the moment of his deepest shame. And then, turning our eyes away from these subordinates, we must fix them lastly on Jesus of Nazareth Himself.

Perhaps it will help our imaginations if we try to raise before them a picture of the scene.

It is the very early morning of an April day, and the first cock has not yet crowed. There is a light flush of dawn appearing in the East, but not enough yet to break the darkness that prevails in the court of the High Priest's house. It is that chilly hour of morning, when men who are astir early, love to gather round a fire.

The place is the central court of an Eastern house, built, no doubt, on the same plan on which such houses are constructed now. A large court-yard open to the sky, with an arcade or cloister supported on pillars round it; at the lower end a door opening to the street, kept by a porter or *concierge*, who has a lodge adjoining. At the upper end there is a large chamber, with a divan or cushioned seat, raised above the general level, ranged along the back wall, with room enough for many persons to sit.

At present that seat is full. And the persons assembled there are indeed of the highest possible importance. It almost takes one's breath away to state what they were. They were the whole representative body then existing of the Holy Universal Church of God. Such the very testimony of the disciples of their victim prove them to have been. For there is the whole council—the *συνέδριον* or Sanhedrim. There are all the Scribes, those who, on the testimony of the prisoner at their bar, sate in Moses' seat, as successors of the great lawgiver. There are all the Elders, successors of those whom Moses had appointed 1,500 years before to aid him in judicial matters. There are all the chief priests, including Annas, the ex-High Priest, and Caiaphas the present one. Imagine this august assembly of princes of the Church in all their pomp of sacerdotal vestments; the Scribes in their long garments, and their broad phylacteries, as their present victim once described them.

At the head of them stands the actual High Priest Caiaphas. He is the first of our three characters, and our minds must dwell for a few moments upon him. He is the president of the High Ecclesiastical Court then assembled, and no judge ever could produce higher credentials than he. The Gospels all acknowledge him, without the slightest apparent doubt, as the legitimate successor of Aaron. He is descendant of a priestly dynasty some 1,500 years old, whose origin was confessedly divine. Besides, the highest power of all had owned his legitimate position, by giving to him the spirit of unconscious prophecy. All will remember how, being High Priest that same year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation.

Now the priesthood of Aaron, which he bore, had never been a bloodthirsty one. There are, I think, only two examples of that priesthood shedding blood. One of these was the stroke of the spear of Phineas—an act of wild justice, suited to the times, which received praise and blessing from above; and the other, the just punishment by Jehoiada of Athaliah, who had murdered all the royal family but one. Whatever other faults they may have had, the priests, the sons of Aaron, had never erred before on the side of intolerance and cruelty. And Caiaphas himself was no fanatic. Like all the family to which he belonged, he was a Sadducee—believed in no resurrection, no angels

nor spirits, no unseen world, and no hereafter. It is scarcely possible for honest fanaticism or enthusiasm to originate in the heart of a man who, like this, has no faith in another world. He had the views of a politician rather than of an ecclesiastic; and, having coolly judged, several weeks before, that the proceedings of Jesus of Nazareth were politically dangerous, he had determined that it would be well to put Him out of the way.

But, in the council that surrounded him, there were many, and perhaps a majority, of strong religious belief and feelings. So, for their sakes, he affected a horror, which he could hardly have felt himself. The High Priest asked Him, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" and Jesus said, "I am; and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Then the High Priest rent his clothes—the original word in St. Mark seems to imply that one of these was the seamless tunic of the High Priest—in sign of a horror, which can hardly have been otherwise than hypocritical in a cool man of the world like him, and said, "What need we any further witnesses. Ye have heard the blasphemy. What think ye?" And then the question being thus put, they all—the whole council, all the scribes, all the elders, all the chief priests, the whole representative body of the Universal Church of God—condemned Him to be guilty of death.

These, then, were the devisers of our Saviour's death. All others who acted in the matter were mere tools and instruments. It is worth while to pause a moment to test the truth or falsehood of this last statement. Ask what were the motives of the other persons engaged? That of Judas was the attraction of the thirty pieces of silver, which the chief priests had promised him. That of Pilate was personal fear of losing his credit with Tiberius Cæsar. The multitude only shouted Crucify because influential persons had raised the cry; left to themselves, they would have still cried Hosanna. The soldiers acted like machines under superior orders. There is no situation in history so astonishing as this, the truth condemned unanimously, the Lord of Truth sentenced unanimously to die, and that by His own Church, whom His Father had founded, whose legitimate authority He had Himself confessed. He came to His own, and His own received Him not. The vineyard of the Lord was the house of Israel, and the men of Judah His pleasant plant; and when He sent His own Son to the vineyard, the vine-dressers, whom He had Himself appointed, took Him, and cast Him out, and slew Him.

And now what a lesson for us arises out of this fact, most astonishing yet most undeniable, that our Lord's death was wholly a sin of the religious world under the guidance of their divinely-appointed leaders. The gross sinners of the world, the publicans and the harlots, had no hand in it at all—only the religious world. And in that religious world we may distinguish all the chief tendencies both of that time and of all times—the Sadducees and the Pharisees, the liberal and the orthodox, the men with the minimum of belief in the supernatural, and those with the maximum of that belief, the traditionists and the anti-traditionists—in fact, the High Church, and the Broad Church, and the Low. The lesson is for our times, why then should we shrink from using the modern phraseology? With what tremendous force does this undeniable fact come upon a Christian congregation, which is a part of the religious world, and especially on religious ministers, who profess to be followers of Jesus of Nazareth. Dare any of us join in any of the party cries of religion in our day, when we know so clearly that even such a party cry once resulted in the crime of crimes? Dare any of us pin his faith upon a hierachy or priesthood, when he reflects whither those were led, who followed the sons of Aaron, under the High Priest Caiaphas, and the Scribes and Pharisees who sat in Moses' seat? In those days authority and tradition utterly failed those who relied upon them, while the light within the heart lighted those who possessed it to the cross and to the glory of the Lord of Truth. It has been nobly said by one who has not always dared to follow his own principle, that a man's conscience is the original Vicar of Jesus Christ—let us add, the only one. He who would find his way through the perplexities of life must keep that light brightly burning within with the flame which the Holy Spirit kindles. Take heed that the light that is within thee be not darkness. If the light that is within thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!

Let us turn our eyes away now from Caiaphas and the splendid array around him to the lower end of the court-yard near the door, where the lower classes are collected. There is a little crowd there, the servants of the high priests, the temple guards, the police officers, with their lanterns or torches, or some of them, not yet burnt out, which they had taken with them a few hours before to Gethsemane. There is a brazier with charcoal in it, shedding a dull red glow. The daybreak is spreading more and more over the sky, so that the lights are dim and varied, falling fitfully hither and thither, now lighting this face for a moment and then another. A few strangers have entered to see the end. All these are within sight of the proceedings at the upper end of the hall, which no doubt is well lighted. Perhaps they are also near enough to hear. Amongst them is one whose speech betrays him to be a Galilean. We know his name (though those around him do not) to be Simon, son of Jonas, who has also the surname Cephas,* or in Greek, Petros. He is thrice recog-

* The two surnames Caiaphas and Cephas are probably the same, כֵּיפָא.—EWALD in *Herzog Realencyclopædia.*

nised as a follower of the accused, and thrice denies the charge. Then the cock crows at early morning, and the Master turns on him with a glance which he feels to single him out, even in the darkness and the crowd; and he goes out at the door, weeping bitterly. Think for a moment, of this poor culprit overwhelmed with sorrow and shame; and then remember that, in another thousand years, there will be another high priest pretending to derive his priesthood from this very Simon, and to possess infallible authority as his successor, doing exactly the same things that Caiaphas is doing, only in a far wider sphere, and with an assumption of supernatural power, and an intolerance, of which Caiaphas would have never dreamed. What may not happen in this wonderful world when such a change as that has actually taken place?

But we have not to do with him as a legendary hero, nor with that dynasty of hierarchs which has founded itself upon his legend, but simply and solely with him as a man.

This strange character, so made up of contradictions as to have been pronounced by that Being who knew him best, at one moment a Rock, and at the next moment a Satan, full of boldness and full of cowardice, the first to confess and the first to deny; this picture of the weakness of all human strength, of the frailty of all earthly goodness, is now at the very depths of his weakness and shame. He stands there a sinner who has just committed a sin—a very mean and cowardly sin. Yet there is an eye upon him, searching for him, busied with him. The Lord Himself is on trial for His life, He is mocked and buffeted and spitted on. But He has time to think of Simon, and attention to devote to His case, and a spirit to send forth for his conversion. The Good Shepherd is being led Himself as a lamb to the slaughter, but He can be seeking His lost sheep even then; He is now amongst the glories of heaven, pain and sorrow all fled away. Has He not thought for those who have committed sins, even very mean sins indeed? We who have betrayed Him and denied Him, the Lord hath turned and looked on . . . let us each supply the blank with His own name. The Lord is turned and is looking on me. Let each of us imagine that searching, inquiring, wistful, longing look. He is seeking. Let Him find.

We have now left ourselves but little time in which to dwell upon the central figure of the scene. And yet that is the whole object of this present day as of the whole Christian life—to look (to look away from all other) unto Jesus—to consider Him who endured such contradiction of sinners against Himself. We see Him in the midst of all this crowd of representative sinners, amongst whom a little honest search will soon enable each of us to detect himself. Betrayed by covetous Judas, forsaken by unwatchful, unprayerful, and therefore easily tempted disciples, denied by self-confident, self-willed Simon, condemned by worldly-minded, unscrupulous Caiaphas, condemned again by timid time-serving, destitute of moral courage, Pilate, persecuted to the death by sanctimonious, theologically-hating Scribes and Pharisees, shouted at by a rude, ignorant multitude, tortured in cruel sport by barbarous soldiers—what species of human sin is absent there? He seems to stand in the midst of the whole menagerie of evil beasts, into whose form sin is able to transform human beings, He Himself, as an apostle afterwards described Him, holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners; they bent on His destruction, and He on their salvation, already beginning to anticipate the work of His next period, by beginning to intercede —"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Let us consider the exceeding beauty of the figure presented to us, and also how that beauty is produced. Compare for one moment any character in a work of fiction—one of the best of Shakespeare's, for example. These, too, are beautiful, but how is their beauty produced? By word-painting of the most exquisite kind. But in the narratives of the Gospels there is no word painting at all, except perhaps a little in St. John. Those are works of the greatest poetic genius, but no such genius has been employed in inditing these simple tales. Those are works of art, but there is no art here—not even that highest one, which has reached perfection, when it has succeeded in completely concealing itself. It is not the narratives that are sublime, but the Being who becomes known to us through their simple inartificial language. He is sublime indeed; no word of admiration that could be attached to His name would be exaggerated or over-strained.

Then we should contemplate His work, the one sacrifice that contained real value, the sacrificer, the victim, the receiver, being all alike divine. The only propitiatory sacrifice that could ever be offered, in which was contained perfect atonement and eternal redemption. Thus the Good Shepherd has accomplished His toilsome journey; He has laid down His life for the sheep.

And now the end of this should be, that every one of us should bring the matter as closely as possible home. Each of us should retire thinking. It was all done for me; it was I that created the necessity; the Good Shepherd came from heaven seeking me; I betrayed, I denied Him—is it not true?

I denied Him many a time by sinful deeds; I mocked, and scorned, and rejected; I crucified—crucified Him afresh many a time, by oft-repeated, obstinately persevered in, sins. He, meanwhile, warned me often, "Watch and pray that thou enter not into temptation," "Behold! Satan hath desired to have thee, that he may sift thee as wheat." Often, too, in the worst passages of life, He turned and looked on me just as He did on Peter. I felt the look, I heard the voice—was not this true?

It was an unfruitful tree that was standing in His vineyard with nothing on it but leaves, and He said, "Spare that tree one year longer." And that intercession has continued year after year, and is continuing still.

Good Friday should be to us the most softening, tendering day of all the year. For, as St. John says, none has seen greater love than this. It is here, at the foot of Christ's Cross, if anywhere, that we can feel a little of the love of Christ constraining, and may be led onward to St. Paul's conclusion by the same steps as His. The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead—dead in trespasses and sins. And He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them, and rose again.

That was his object; let that object be at last gained in you and me. Let Him, in each of us, see of the travail of His soul, and be satisfied.

THE SACRIFICE OF JESUS CHRIST.

By the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of Pusey House, Oxford.

Sermon Preached in the Temple Church, London, on Sunday Morning, March 13th, 1892.*

"For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"—Heb. ix. 13, 14.

THE sacrifice of our Lord admits of being considered from many different points of view. We may consider it as making atonement for our sins, and ask how any such transference and application of His merits to us, as is involved in this thought, is possible; or we may consider why any such atonement should have been necessary at all to satisfy the requirements of the Divine Righteousness in the moral government of the world. Both of these questions are legitimate, and the New Testament does in fact suggest answers to them. But there is another consideration, simpler perhaps than either of these, which is yet full of importance, and comes first in the order of thought, and that is, the nature of Christ's sacrifice, considered not in its effect on us, but simply in itself; of what sort was Christ's sacrifice and wherein lay its acceptableness? It is to this question alone that I would challenge your attention this morning. I will ask of you the self-restraint which is necessary to gain clearness in one particular point before proceeding to another.

Why is it that a man's mind on theological subjects is so often of the nature of a kaleidoscope in which every form passes with bewildering confusion into every other, or presents so foggy a scene that no single object has definite and distinct outline? Why in theological conversation does a man find it so difficult to keep himself to a single point, to prevent himself from passing unconciously, let us say, from the Incarnation to the Atonement, or from the credibility of the Creed to the inspiration of Scripture, or to the meaning of Church communion? All this vagueness and confusion comes, at least in great measure, from our not taking pains enough to concentrate our attention on single important points, and to gain clearness in one before we approach another. I ask your attention, then, this morning to a single topic—the sacrifice of Christ, and to a single aspect of that topic—viz., the character of that sacrifice considered simply in itself, without reference to its making possible the forgiveness of our sins. The Apostolic writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews finds its distinctive character in four points:—

1. It was the offering of a person; self-sacrifice. He offered Himself to God.

2. The Person was blameless. He offered Himself without spot or blemish.

3. It was a spiritual sacrifice: "in spirit."

4. The spirit in which He offered Himself was eternal spirit.

Each of these points will claim our attention in turn.

First, then, He offered His Self, His Person, His human life to God. This human life of ours is meant to move in various directions. It moves out to the interpretation and appropriation of nature; and so man gains in natural knowledge, and develops the resources of civilisation. It moves out again from each man towards his fellows, and so the bonds of humanity are knit, and society advances. It moves out also towards God, to present itself before Him, and enter into communion with Him. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart (or will), with all thy soul (or life, the sum of the faculties), and with all thy mind (*i.e.*, capacity for thought and knowledge)." All the faculties of man are thus to be directed not only towards nature, towards his fellow-men, but also deliberately Godward, and that first of all. It is "the first and great commandment." All the material which life affords is not only to be used as a means of progress or as instrumental for social intercourse; it is also to be converted into a free-will offering, in which man presents himself living and free before the face of God in conscious rational homage. This was the original law of man's being. This is his ultimate goal in Christianity. "I beseech you, brethren," St. Paul writes, "by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service."

This "reasonable service," which St. Paul calls a "sacrifice," though there be no death involved

* This Sermon has already appeared in the *Guardian*.

in it, is what is supremely exemplified in the human life of Jesus. It looked manward in love and ministry. "He went about doing good." But first of all it looked Godward in self-oblation. "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God." Aye, even before "Thy will be done" comes "Thy name be hallowed." For to please God, to present himself before God, to know God, this is the highest privilege and the primary duty of man. Foolishly, shallowly, men sometimes suggest that to take thought for God, and seek the face of God, and study to know God is to divert the faculties without profit from the really useful end of human improvement—

> . . . Presume not God to scan:
> The proper study for mankind is man.

What a shallow philosophy! For why is it that we make, in fact, so little social improvement? Why is it we are so falsely, ignobly tolerant of injustice, and selfishness, and lust in society and within ourselves? Why are efforts for the good of man so seldom persevered in through disappointment, or so frequently allowed to degenerate into effortless routine? Why? In a word, because we do not think enough about God. If we constantly and systematically gazed up at Him, and let His inexorable holiness, His truth, His beauty, His love, His power—more than all, the claim of his Fatherhood over us His sons, penetrate our whole beings, we should be more vigorous and persevering in moral effort—aye, and more successful. It was the Apostles, who were so full of the vision of God, who turned the world upside down. Jesus then our Master, the pattern man, offered His whole being first, and continually, and in all its faculties, as a freewill offering to God.

Secondly, He offered Himself "without spot" or "blemish." The metaphor is from the inspection of the victims prepared for sacrifice. In the Lamb of God the scrutiny of the all-seeing eye can detect no disqualifying flaw. The sinlessness of Jesus is a fact no less contrary to our experience of humanity than is the miraculous mode of His entrance into our mortal life or His exit from it. Everywhere in human nature where you inspect it at all narrowly you discern the fact of sin. It is what baffles or maddens the philanthropist and sometimes turns him into a cynic. It embitters and enfeebles our own inner lives. It may be selfishness, or avarice, or lust, or impatience, or untrustworthiness, or presumption, or hopelessness, or want of love and faith. It is in part inherited, and in part due to personal misuse of one's own powers. It varies in degree and character from man to man, from society to society, from age to age. But everywhere it is a personal experience. And everywhere as it impoverishes and disorders human life, so, when the soul becomes enlightened as to the true holiness of God, it makes man tremble, like Felix, at the bare mention of righteousness and judgment to come; it disqualifies man altogether for approaching God's Presence. But in our Lord there was the fulness of human faculty coupled with the absence as of any moral defect or sense of deficiency, so of any limitation which does not eventually belong to human nature itself. A will always vigorous, single, unflagging; an intellect wholly unclouded and unsophisticated, of perfect receptivity and exquisite penetration; a heart of incomparable tenderness and force, which yet never moved out in uncontrolled passion; a perfect humanity which yet showed its perfection in unresisting dependence upon the movement of the Divine Spirit which filled it and directed it; a humanity rich and full in experiences, passing through all sorts of vicissitudes of circumstance, yet found as perfect in one situation as in another, in failure as in success; a humanity in which nothing approaching to moral decadence is to be detected, glorious in its issue as in its inception. He offered Himself to God without blemish. He fulfilled the ideal of humanity. He was the beloved Son in Whom the Father—the great Scrutinizer of human oblations—was well pleased.

Thirdly, the sacrifice of Jesus was a full, perfect, and adequate self-oblation of man to God. This is, in other words, to say that it was perfectly "spiritual," "He offered Himself in Spirit." We Englishmen have not infrequently a crudely false notion that what is "spiritual" in our humanity is opposed to what is "material" and "visible"; that what is visible and tangible cannot be spiritual. Never is such a notion countenanced in the New Testament. The "spiritual" is indeed opposed to the "carnal," and to the "formal," for the word "carnal" expresses the disordered state of things in which the higher part of our nature is ruled by the lower; and "formal" is the word to describe a course of action in which the will and intelligence is not really engaged; while "spiritual" is the word for what is completely human—that is, for every action in which the will and intellect are truly at work, the intelligence truly recognising the Divine Presence and purpose in the circumstances of a particular case, and the will truly carrying out the Divine Law. That is spiritual in humanity which expresses in our creation the will and mind of God, the Eternal Spirit. Thus, "worship in spirit and in truth" may be worship expressed (as what is human must be expressed) in material forms; but it is worship in which the intelligence recognises God, and the will directs towards Him the whole being in humble adoration. Sacrifice is spiritual, which, like the sacrifice of Jesus, is expressed in the body—for it was "an offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all"—but which carries with it an act of real homage on the part of the intelligence and the will.

There is something spiritual in all human habits of sacrifice. Everywhere, as we scan the human horizon, man appears as a sacrificing being. Sacrifice is the characteristic action of universal

religion. Generally it seems to express one or more of three ideas—the idea of communion or partaking with some God, the idea of dependence upon Him, and the idea of deprecating His wrath by a present. Something thus spiritual is to be found in all sacrifices—some recognition of truth. But this spirituality is overclouded and sometimes almost obliterated by the prevalence of mere routine, and still more by gross misconception of the being and character of God. Most readers are acquainted with Prescott's interesting volumes on the Conquest of Mexico. And we may remember to have been almost thrilled by the accounts he gives us of the sacrificial system which the Spaniards found established in the Aztec polity. Here was a nation more sacrificial than the Jews —a nation whose policy was directed by the exigences of sacrifice, and whose institutions centred upon it. But the idea of sacrifice was discoloured in dark and lurid hues by the horrible bloodthirsty character of the chief gods whom they worshipped. What by contrast was the Jewish sacrificial system? To appreciate it aright—as indeed to appreciate aright most portions of the Old Testament—we must grasp the idea that God's moral estimate of things, the true moral estimate, depends, in institutions as in individual lives, not on the level to which they have attained, but on the amount of moral movement which they represent and on the rightness of its direction. It is the tendency and direction of the Jewish sacrificial system which makes it spiritually significant. It was a system in which, under Divine education, the crude Semitic habits of sacrifice were gradually organised and spiritualised. It is a mistake to suppose that God instituted, directly, the Jewish sacrifices. The habit of sacrifice was traditional and universal. What God did was to condescend to very imperfect customs of Hebrew tradition and make them the instruments of gradual education. Hear St. Chrysostom on the matter—in a context where he is explaining how God led the Wise Men to Bethlehem through their own astrology :—

"Think it not," he says, "then, unworthy of Him to have called them by a star; for by the same rule thou wilt find fault with all the Jewish rites also—both the sacrifices and the purifications and the new moons, and the ark, and the temple itself. For all these things had their origin from Gentile grossness. Yet God, on account of the salvation of those in error, endured to be worshipped by means of the very rites through which those outside were worshipping demons, only giving them a slight alteration, that little by little He might draw them away from their customs, and lead them up to the high philosophy."

How, then, were Jewish instincts of sacrifice gradually spiritualised? Partly by the prohibition of human sacrifices and the abolition of cruelty to animal victims—restrictions which bore with them a true lesson as to God's character. Partly by the deep and truly symbolic teaching as to sinful man's relation to God which the moulding of the Holy Spirit impressed upon the sacrificial ordinances. Partly—chiefly perhaps—by the accompanying stream of prophetic teaching which, always in the ears of Israelites, taught them the fundamental uselessness of all mere animal victims. "Thou requirest no sacrifice, else would I give it Thee; but Thou delightest not in burnt-offerings. The sacrifices of God are a troubled spirit—a broken and a contrite heart." "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?"

The Divine education of the Jews pointed on to Jesus, and in Him was fulfilled. His sacrifice was, as much as their own, material, visible, objective. As He hangs upon the Cross, He fills in the Christian imagination that sort of central place, as in a great spectacle, which only an outward, visible enactment of sacrifice could have filled. But the sacrifice is supremely spiritual. Its whole moral meaning lies in the obedience it involved. He was obedient. He, the pattern Man, gave to God an undivided allegiance, an absolute homage. When His mission on behalf of truth, and meekness and righteousness involved the martyr's death—He accepted the condition, and offered the shedding of His blood. But in God's sight the shedding of the blood had no value except as the symbol of obedience carried to an extreme. This is the teaching, emphatic enough, of the tenth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the sacrifice of our Lord is put in strong contrast to the sacrifices of the law, just in this respect, that it was simply the offering of a son's obedience:—"It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when He cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me. In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of Me) to do Thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings and offering for sin Thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein, which are offered by the law; then said He, Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."

It is a great, a strange mistake to suppose that the death of Christ was, as it were, the act of God. It was the act in which (on the contrary) rebellion against God, the sin of man, showed itself in its true and horrible colours. What God does is to bear with this, as He has foreseen it, to spare not His only Son, to exempt Him by no miracle from the consequences of His loyalty to truth and meekness and righteousness—under the conditions of a sinful world, as things were, its inevitable conse-

quences. God foresees, God bears with this, and He overrules it to the purposes of our redemption. But throughout, as St. Anselm says, in the greatest Christian treatise on the Atonement, what God the Father enjoined upon the Incarnate Son was, primarily, simple obedience; only as obedience in fact involved death, then, secondarily, did He enjoin upon Him to die. There are splendid instances in actual history, or imaginative history, of acts in which men have poured out their blood as a sacrifice for their fellow-men. It is the deep moral feeling of Euripides which converts the unwilling sacrifice of Iphigenia in Aulis into a freewill offering for her country. "The whole of Greece, the truly great, is looking to me now," she cries to her mother . . . . "for all the Greeks and not for thyself alone, didst thou bear me; therefore for Greece I offer my body." So she gives herself to be sacrificed by the priest's knife, and the goddess Artemis accepts the freewill offering—but not the actual life; for as the knife is falling, the place of the maiden is, by the intervention of the goddess, taken by a doe. And of the maiden it is said that the same day beheld her dead and alive again. This is a splendid thought. But it is the nobility of the victim which is supposed to move the compassion of the goddess rather than the simple worth of a human life, and the atmosphere of religious conception as to the Divine nature is still far cloudier than among the Jews. On the Jewish stage a cognate but more truly historical scene is described in the Book of Maccabees, where the heroic martyrs for the honour and liberty of the chosen people offer up their lives to God. "And I," cries the youngest of the seven martyred brothers, "as my brethren offer up my body and life for the laws of our fathers, beseeching God that He would speedily be merciful unto our nation . . . and that in me and my brethren the wrath of the Almighty which is justly brought upon all our nation may cease." This is a self-sacrifice which comes very near to Isaiah's conception of the vicarious self-oblation of Jehovah's righteous servant. But it has still accompanying it some ring of the false thought of God as demanding for sin some positive quantity of expiatory death. Now when we describe the sacrifice of our Lord as perfectly spiritual, we mean that it carries with it, in all its silent implications and in the spoken words in which it found expression, the perfect truth about God and about man, as the flawless homage of the self-surrendering will. Jesus taught the perfect truth in words—the truth about God's pure Fatherhood; the truth that what God asks of man, who is made for sonship, is not mere isolated acts of obedience or sacrifice, but simply and altogether the homage of an unqualified submission and dependence. He taught the truth about man's sin, about his rebellion, about his need of conversion. He taught the truth about the unity of the human race—bidding men see that they may not live each for himself, but are bound to live each for all. He taught all this in words; He taught it in deeds, in His own human relation to the Father; in His own relation to mankind. He taught it most of all in His sacrifice. For when obedience was shown to involve death, He spared not Himself, even as the Father spared Him not; He used no miraculous power to exempt Himself, though He declared that He possessed it. "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He will at once give Me more than twelve legions of angels." He rendered to the Divine righteousness an allegiance unqualified. He reversed in His utter submission all the lawlessness and wilfulness of human history. The Son of Man, the second Adam, was obedient unto death. Sin in its horrible ugliness, horrible beyond conception in His eyes, came and looked Him in the face. He shuddered indeed, as in the agony of the garden, "as if He could not bear to see the sinfulness of sin so near." He took in its horrible bulk and proportions, as (in Judas and Caiaphas and Pilate, in the soldiers and the Jews) it came upon Him, handing Him over to a death, the awful unnaturalness of which only the very Lord of Life could know. He bore the burden that obedience laid upon Him. He offered His life, in the perfect exercise of free will—He who had power over His life to lay it down and power to take it again. The sins of man (the long drawn-out consequences of which were closing in upon Him to kill Him) were sins in which His stainless heart was wholly free from participation, but He bore their load as man and for man, rebelling not one whit against the awful burden which His fellowship in our common humanity laid upon Him. For us, in our manhood, before God He shed His blood. And this blood-shedding has, in God's sight, a perfect value, because it is the expression of a flawless will, of truth unqualified—the truth about God's claim on man, the truth about humanity's proper homage, the truth about sin. And the self-sacrifice of Jesus lives for evermore, over against all our lawlessness, our wilfulness, our slackness, our blindness, our self-sparing, as the perfect recognition in man's name and nature of the righteous claim of God, and of the responsibility of man for man.

Fourthly, and for the last time, as the sacrifice of Jesus was perfectly spiritual, so it was offered, not only in the power of the perfect humanity, but in the power also of the eternal Spirit. He through the eternal Spirit, or "in eternal Spirit," offered Himself. It is doubted whether this refers exactly to the Holy Spirit considered as inspiring; as It undoubtedly did, the humanity of Christ, or to the eternal nature of the Son, and we need not now discuss the question exactly. In any case what is being taught us is, that Christ's act of sacrifice was not only human, but Divine; the "spirit" expressed in it—the will, the consciousness at work

there—was not temporary, changeable, created, but "eternal Spirit," not man's only, but God's. God, "eternal Spirit," was acting in manhood in the sacrifice of Christ. Truly was he acting in manhood, really under conditions of manhood: the sacrifice was genuinely human in its moral effort, in its moral and physical pain, in its genuine human faith. It was the Son of Man Who offered Himself. But the mind and will expressed was also God's mind, God's will; and, therefore, the meaning and value of the act is unchangeable. It is true of all human action at its best that it has an eternal element. "The truly great have all one age." But the eternal element, the movement of God which lies hid at all times at the roots of humanity is obscured and clouded by human independence of God, that is, human sin. In Jesus every human act is also the act of God. He who was acting under human conditions was very God; and the Divine Spirit Which indwelt His humanity, indwelt Him perfectly, and found in Him a faultless organ in which His will could be done. Nothing, then, in the acts or sacrifice of Jesus is merely temporary, or imperfect, or inadequate. It belongs to all ages. It is eternal. Jesus could plead the outpoured blood as a blood of sprinkling, as an accepted sacrifice, even before His death, at the institution of the Eucharist. "This is My Blood, which is being poured out for you." He lives for ever since His death upon the Cross, true Man in the power of His self-oblation, the one eternal Mediator. Nothing can antiquate this act; nothing can add to it. It is a full, perfect, sufficient sacrifice; a recognition in man's nature of God's claim, which is for ever adequate; it is a sacrifice in eternal spirit offered without spot to God.

I have asked your attention to a single point—to the sacrifice of Jesus considered in itself. Do not ask at this moment "why was that sacrifice necessary that we should be forgiven our past sins?" or "how can its merits become ours?" or "how can Jesus represent us?" Put aside these questions for the moment. Fix your attention only upon the sacrifice considered in itself. Scan its lineaments, meditate on its moral meaning, on what it discloses about God's Fatherhood and His claim, about man's sonship and its homage, about the unity of men with one another, about sin and its consequences. Meditate on it, and then ask yourself whether you can withhold your assent to the Apostle's appeal. The blood of goats and bulls, he says, had a certain value. It maintained a ceremonial sanctity in the Jewish race. It kept alive their sense of consecration to God: of being a priestly race. It did something in the external sphere. Even it could not be without effect. But if the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling those who had contracted ceremonial impurity consecrated to an external cleanliness, how much more shall the blood of Christ—that blood which expresses perfect moral homage, that blood which is not physical merely but moral; the blood of Him Who in a spirituality not real only but eternal, offered Himself, a humanity without blemish, before the face of God—how much more shall this have its effect. Such an act cannot be unfruitful. It must somehow have power to regenerate the humanity in whose name it was wrought. Ask not yet how, but acknowledge that it must somehow produce effect. "Shall not the blood of Christ purge your consciences?" I do not say now from the guilt of past sin, but from its fruitlessness, its apathy, its death, from dead works, to serve the living God. Are you weighed down by care, or world anxiety, or constant worry? Are you crushed into pessimism by the failure of man? Or are you selfish and indifferent, using the opportunities of wealth "to hide yourself from your own flesh?" Would you, I say, exempt yourself from the common burden of humanity? Then look at Him, Jesus. He exempted not Himself. He taught in an eternal object-lesson that humanity is one, that each must live for all. Are you oppressed with suffering? He bore all man's burden, spiritual and physical, and turned each pang of body and mind into the material of a richer sacrifice to God. Or are you pessimist? Then look at the issue of Christ's sacrifice. For the joy that was set before Him—the joy of fruitfulness, the joy of achievement—He endured the Cross. He knew that in perfect meekness and perfect obedience there is ultimately perfect fruitfulness and supreme power. And He saw of the travail of His soul, and was satisfied. His beloved disciple beheld the throne of the universe occupied by the "slaughtered Lamb," receiving the adoration of heaven and of earth. Meekness, then, is not ineffective. Truth and righteousness are not weak. Do not be pessimistic, do not be despondent. Lift up the hands that hang down and the feeble knees. Shall not the sacrifice of Christ put new life into you? Shall not the blood of Christ, Who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God, simply because it has been shed, somehow purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

HOUSE SCHOLARSHIPS at Oakham School have been awarded to Keeton, Mr. Brown's, Hunstanton; Humfrey, Mr. Humfrey's, Thorpe Mandeville; Fisher, Mr. Lee's, Higham; Mason and Wright, Miss Franklin's, Leicester; Baxter and Hynde, Oakham School.

AT Uppingham the following boys have been recommended for entrance scholarships:—C. M. Wynne (Mr. Rhodes), A. K. Smith, V. J. Wooley, E. B. Fisher (Uppingham Lower School), L. A. Haward (Gresson's School), R. A. Raven (Fauconberge School, Beccles), W. H. Stopford (Mr. Cotterill), M. A. Collins (Fauconberge School, Beccles); Rutland Scholarships, S. Royce, R. F. Hodge.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1892.

THE HAYDOCK DIFFICULTY.

THE dispute about the new incumbent of Haydock has been settled by the Archbishop of York's definite refusal to institute the presentee. His Grace bases his refusal on two grounds: first, he declines to institute a clergyman in American orders; next, he thinks that a clergyman of less than ten years' service in orders ought not to be instituted to any living at all.

It is well known that His Grace's first reason obtains nearly all over England, and we suppose that there are good grounds for it. At the same time we cannot help thinking that, considering our present attitude towards American clergy, it is somewhat illogical, If there is anything unseemly in a man in American orders holding an English benefice, we presume that he ought not to preach in an English church or undertake any of the duties of what is known as a cure of souls. In other words, he must either be in Holy Orders, as we consider them, all in all or not at all. But at present a sort of compromise obtains, and we admit men in American orders to our pulpits and to all our services, and allow them to hold *locum tenencies*, but they are not fit to hold livings. Why not?

However, the question is never likely to be of much importance, for we fancy that very few of the American clergy would feel inclined to change their sphere, not to say their hemisphere. The Archbishop's second reason is more startling. Dr. Maclagan was once an officer, and he takes care to let us know it. We trust it will not be long before he learns that the affairs of a great province are not to be managed in the method adopted by the captain of a company. Dr. Maclagan is anxious to do the right thing, but he is doing it in the wrong way—mere system will never bring about the improvement which he is anxious to obtain. We never heard much about his experiments in the direction of a pulpit censorship; at all events his late diocese never became remarkable for the high level of pulpit excellence, in spite of the enormous labour and infinite inconvenience caused by the said censorship. A man who can preach is only hampered by restrictions and limitations; a man who cannot will never be improved by them. It is all very well to try to prevent men talking and preaching nonsense, but it is better to hear a man pronounce his own thoughts, however unimportant, in his own language, however unadorned, than to listen to the mechanical utterance of the suggestions and criticisms of somebody else, even if the somebody be a bishop. Moreover, it is quite possible that the foolishness of a curate may be, to the minds of those who know and understand him, wiser than the wisdom of a Doctor of Divinity.

So it is with promotion to benefices. A man need not wait till the age of thirty-three or thirty-four before he shows what stuff he is made of, and a parson who is worth his salt does not want ten years to learn the duties of a parish priest. He has got most of them born in him, or ought to have; while a man may be a curate not for ten only but for twenty years, and be no more fit to manage a parish than he was at first. Men are wanted, not systems; you cannot manage a parish by the aid of a drill-book and a manual exercise. It is even possible to have too much experience, and many rectors and vicars have proved great failures, because they had lost all originality and initiative, and knew nothing but drill; in fact, they were only fit to be curates.

Dr. Maclagan has at heart the interests of the Church; we trust he will soon learn wiser and better ways of promoting them.

THE annual series of Shakesperian Memorial Performances, at Stratford-on-Avon, have again this year, for the fifth time, been undertaken by Mr. F. R. Benson, and will consist of eight representations of Shakesperian plays, including a most interesting revival of "Timon of Athens," a tragedy that has not been seen on the boards since Phelps produced it at Sadler's Wells about twenty-five years ago. The performances commence on Monday, April 18th, and will be as follows:—Monday, 18th, and Tuesday, 19th, "A Midsummer's Night Dream"; Wednesday, 20th, "Julius Cæsar"; Thursday, 21st, "Twelfth Night"; Friday, 22nd, and Saturday, 23rd (Shakespeare's birthday), "Timon of Athens." There will be also two *matinées*, one of a "Midsummer's Night Dream," on Monday, 18th, and one of "Timon of Athens," on Saturday, 23rd. Special trains will be run from London on Friday, the 15th, and Friday, the 22nd. There will also be special trains from Northampton, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Leamington, and surrounding districts.

THE BOOK OF ARMAGH.

By the late Right Rev. WILLIAM REEVES, D.D., LL.D., M.B., President of the Royal Irish Academy, Hon. Mem. Soc. Antiq., Scot. and Zurich, Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore.

(*Continued from page* 177.)

Of the name McMoyre, the earliest instance on record is in Primate Swetemau's Register, at 1367, where Thomas MacMoer is stated to owe the Primate the sum of four shillings, probably a year's rent of his holdings. In the following century the tenant was reduced to great straits by reason of the usurpations of the O'Neill family in the territory of the Fews, where these lands lay. On the 21st August, 1427, Primate Swayne granted an Indulgence of forty days to all and singular who should contribute out of their substance to the relief of Moyre Nakanany (*i.e*, *Maor na Canoine*, "Keeper of the Canon"), of the diocese of Armagh, who had been impoverished by depredations made upon him at royal instigation. But Primate Mey was obliged, not long after, to check the presumption of this official, or his successor, when, in 1455, he, in conjunction with the Keeper of St. Patrick's Bell, laid claim to the firstlings of sheep through the diocese, and drew forth a prohibition against paying the said contribution to any unauthorised person, and especially the *Bajulator Canonis*, and the *Custos Companæ*.

Whether there was subsequently a temporary withdrawal of the Canon from the MacMoyre family, or that O'Mulmoid, now called Mulloy, was the hereditary as MacMoyre was the official name of the family, cannot now be decided: but certain it is that, on the 16th of July, 1484, Maurice O'Mulmoid, Bajulator Canonis, and Peter O'Mulmoid, Prior of the Culdees, were witnesses to the oath of fealty which was taken by the Bishop of Raphoe.

The next notice that we meet with of the family is in the Armagh Inquisition of 1609, in which it is found that "the sept of Clann MacMoyre, and their auncestors, tyme out of mynde, were, and yet are, possessed of eight tounes of land, with the appurtenances, in the barony of the Fuighes, and that they held the same of the Lord Archbishop of Armagh for the yearly rent of a mark Irish, out of every of the said taunes, amounting in the whole to four pounds per annum." There was also a house in Armagh, which was held under the Abbot of St. Peter and St. Paul's, called "the Serjeant of Ballymoyrie's tenement," which passed, together with the other possessions of the abbey, to Lord Caulfeild, whose tenant on the premises, in 1663, was called Art MacMoyer. These eight townlands, now known as Aghincurk, Ballintate, Ballintemple, Cavanakill, Corlat, Knockavannon, Lurgana, and Outleckan, contain 7,381 acres, estimated at £3,490, a-year, in the Poor Law valuation; and in themselves constitute a parish, called Ballymyre, that is, "Keeper's-town," in the union of Armagh. Before 1622 they had passed out of the MacMoyre family, and George Fairfax was the possessor under the See of Armagh.

We now leave the Keeper for a little, and return to the Book.

The famous Archbishop Ussher was raised to the Primacy of Ireland in 1625, and in 1639 published his Antiquities of the British Churches. In the interval, and even previously to 1613, while his uncle Henry was Archbishop of Armagh, he had ample opportunities of becoming acquainted with this ancient monument of the See: not that he was ever the possessor of it, or was allowed to do more than make extracts from it, because it had then become, like the Bell, and other reliquaries, the private property of the Keeper's family who seem to have clung to it with religious fidelity, even in the days of their decadence and dispossession; or else it surely would, like other literary treasures, have found its way into the Primate's noble and absorbing collection. But he had access to it, and this indulgence argued a liberal and forgiving temper in the possessor, who had been turned out of his lands, and was now reduced in condition and estate. The Archbishop often refers to it in his Religion of the Ancient Irish, published in 1631, under the title of "Ancient Manuscript of the Church of Armagh." He even gives the greater part of Brian's charter, already mentioned, but omits the last clause, being probably unable to master two difficult words which occur in it. It is to be lamented that he did not record the history of the book, which was well known in his day, for he could surely have handed down to us many curious traditions concerning it which now are irrecoverably lost.

Sir James Ware was somewhat more communicative. In 1656 he published a small duodecimo of 156 pages, entitled the Opuscula of St. Patrick, the first tract in it being the Confession of St. Patrick, for which he collated our manuscript, which he calls by the same name as Ussher, "Codex Ecclesiæ Armachanæ," and concerning which he subjoins the following notice:—"The Manuscript of the Church of Armagh contains, besides St. Patrick's Confession, the Holy Bible after the version of St. Hierome, and a very ancient copy of Sulpicius Severus on the Life of St. Martin, Bishop of Tours. It was formerly held in such esteem, that the family of MacMoyer held lands of the See of Armagh for the safe custody of the manuscript. The general belief, that it was written by St. Patrick's own hand, was a special means of gaining deep veneration for the book. And certainly, at the end of his Confession, these words are to be read:—'So far the volume which Patrick wrote with his own hand'; and after this:—'On the 17th of March, Patrick was translated to heaven.' However, from the style of the letter, it is quite manifest that it is not his autograph, but a transcript made at a much later age."

Its possessor at, or soon after the date of Sir James' publication, was Florence MacMoyer. This appears by his autograph entry on a blank page at the reverse of the 104th leaf:—"Liber Flarentini Muire. June 29th, 1672;" which is the more interesting as he was the last hereditary Keeper of the Book, and his signature identifies the volume as the veritable "Canon of Armagh," ere it passed into strange hands, where its ancient prestige soon died away.

In December, 1679, Doctor Oliver Plunket, titular Archbishop of Armagh, was apprehended on a charge of high treason, and a number of witnesses were suborned against him by Hetherington, Lord Shaftesbury's agent. At the close of the succeeding year, one Owen Murphy was busily employed collecting witnesses to prove the alleged Popish Plot. Of these he gathered together a plentiful supply, who, as Lord Ormond said, "went out of Ireland with bad English and worse clothes, but returned well-bred gentlemen, periwigged and clothed: brogues and leather straps converted to fashionable shoes, and glittering buckles;

which, next to the zeal tories, thieves, and friars have for the Prostestant religion, is a main inducement to bring in a shoal of informers. The worst is, they are so miserably poor, we are fain to give them some allowance, and they find it more honourable and safe to be king's evidence than a cow-stealer, though that be their natural profession." The witnesses arrived in London, January, 1681, and on the 5th of May, Dr. Oliver Plunket was arraigned at the King's Bench for high treason, before Chief Justice Sir Francis Pemberton. The Keeper was one of the witnesses ; and the first man examined was this Florence MacMoyer, or Florence Wyer, as he is called by the Solicitor-General in the State Trials. Among other things, he stated on his examination, that Captain O'Neill, who had urged him to enter the French army, alleged that he could return to Ireland as a captain, under the French king, surprise the kingdom, and settle the Popish religion ; and that then *he would be restored to his estate.* He further declared himself to be "a Roman Catholic and Papist."

Another witness was a friar, called Moyer, who was his kinsman ; and a third, John Moyer. All of whom Doctor Plunket, in his defence, characterised as "merciless perjurers," and declared in his dying speech that he was not acquainted with the layman, Florence MacMoyer, at all. Serjeant Jeffries, in summing up, insisted most on Florence Wyer's testimony. Doctor Plunket was executed on the 1st July, 1681. The same party next appeared against Lord Shaftesbury, and when their gains were expended, most of them returned to Ireland to endure the horrors of remorse, or end their days in degradation and want.

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION.

SIR,—I feel perplexed when I endeavour to understand the letter of "Vindex" in to-day's PULPIT. He asks how anything in his previous letter suggested that he held the doctrine of annihilation or extinction of being? I have read the letter once more, and do not see how any one can fail to draw that conclusion from it. He states, at the commencement, "that man has no eternal life or immortality of either soul or body in himself." He states at the end that Scripture, apart from the notion of inalienable immortality, teaches "not eternal torment, but something very different, viz., eternal death, everlasting destruction . . . the destruction of both soul and body in hell." If consciousness is preserved, it is torment; if consciousness is lost, it is practically extinction of being. I do not see any alternative, and would beg for an explanation.

In regard to the great plan of Creation and Providence, it is a vast subject, and I can only venture on a few remarks in a letter of this kind. It seems clear to me that every individual of Adam's race is brought into existence without a particle of knowledge, and with imperfect and untrained faculties, often with hereditary tendencies of an adverse kind. I understand the grand, benevolent object to be, to furnish the whole collectively with all that is necessary to prepare them for a holy and happy immortality. I published a book, in 1870, under the title of "Complete Triumph of Moral Good over Evil." I will quote a passage which, I think, indicates my ideas with sufficient clearness :—"I can imagine two modes of training intelligent beings for an endless existence. The one is the 'Happy Valley' system of careful shelter and constraint (Rasselas) ; the other of free exposure to dangers and contingencies, with the inevitable result of moral evil and its countless woes. . . . The one system would cultivate kindly, gentle, and benevolent feelings. . . . The other would inure them to hardships in every shape, expose them to raging passions, vices, and crimes,—to agony, darkness, horror, and despair ; but would also bring out hope and trust, unshaken courage, unwavering constancy, inextinguishable tenderness ; would call forth indomitable fortitude, patient self-control, unhesitating self-sacrifice ; would brace up the soul to heroic efforts and unflinching endurance. Under the one, the Creator would appear as the benignant and mild Parent of a well-ordered family. Under the other He displays exquisite sensibilities and strong feelings, the most unwearied patience and unswerving firmness. He oftimes envelops Himself in darkness, hides the tenderness of His nature, assumes an aspect of unrelenting wrath, is content to be misunderstood and calumniated for ages. He takes upon Him an unceasing course of irksome labours, subjects Himself to the most painful sacrifices—even, in a certain sense, descending for a time from the unruffled felicity of the Godhead, and placing Himself in the front rank of the fierce conflict between Moral Good and Moral Evil."

In reply to the enquiry of "Vindex," whether I believe that the human soul "is of its nature indestructible," it is my undoubting persuasion that if divine energy and support were withheld for a moment, all created existence would vanish. At the same time, I understand the Scriptures to indicate clearly that immortality is conferred on intelligent beings and will be sustained.

J. B.

Canonbury, April 9th, 1892.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." April, 1892. Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark.

WE most highly commend the short and clear account of *what* the controversy Mr. Gore has caused really is, *as far as it goes.* To put it still more shortly, the writer clearly sees there are but two alternatives. Either (1) our Lord was ignorant of the non-Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm, or (2) He used "accommodation." But to our thinking there is yet a further difficulty; Is (1) consistent with His Divinity? Is (2) consistent with perfect truthfulness? The writer leans evidently in favour of 2, which we think raises a far greater difficulty than 1, for the *Church Quarterly* for last October showed, we think, that ignorance on such a subject as this was in no way inconsistent with His Divinity.

A good deal of further evidence is given as to the use of the Revised Version. Generally the opinions are in favour of its use.

The tone of all the articles in the *Expository* is very bright and genial.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Archibald, Rev. John, Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Keith, and Synod Clerk of Moray, Ross, and Caithness; Honorary Canon of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Inverness.
Asker, Rev. George Edward, M.A.; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Lambeth.
Barlow, Rev. H. E. T., M.A., Principal of Bishop Wilson Theological School; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.
Barrett, Rev. Benjamin, Vicar of Braunston; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Rutland.
Bedford, Rev. W. C. R., M.A., Vicar of Knowle; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Warwickshire.
Braund, Rev. Ebenezer; Rector of Bittadon, Barnstaple.
Bulteel, Rev. Courtenay J., Curate of Kingston; Vicar of Christow, Devonshire.
Clark, Rev. Henry T., M.A., Curate of All Saints', Daresbury, Cheshire; Chaplain of St. Philip's, Kelsall, in the parish of St. Andrew's, Tarvin, Chester.
Collom, Rev. Charles Frederick, B.A., Vice-Principal of the Agricultural College, Downton; Licensed to Officiate in the diocese of Salisbury.
Davis, Rev. Weston Brocklesby, M.A.; Vicar of Ramsbury, Wilts.
Dennett, Rev. William Walter, M.A., Curate of St. Stephen-the-Martyr, Avenue-road, N.W.; Assistant-Diocesan Inspector of Schools for Northamptonshire, diocese of Peterborough.
Vawdrey, Rev. H. B., M.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Chad's, Tushingham, Cheshire.
Waller, Rev. S., M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Ware, Rev. F. L., M.A.; Vicar of St. Mary's, Edmonton.
Watters, Rev. H. J., B.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Watson, Rev. Wentworth, M.A., Vicar of Monmouth; Vicar of St. Thomas-the-Martyr, Oxford.
Webb, Rev. Samuel William Parrajotti, Curate of East Ham; Rector of Ashwell, Herts.
Wheeler, Rev. George Domvile Chetwynd, M.A.; Vicar of Cleobury Mortimer, Salop.
Willock, Rev. Robert Peel, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. James's, Hope, Eccles; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lancashire, Mr. John Knowles, of Westwood, Pendlebury.
Woffindin, Rev. Henry, M.A.; Vicar of Bridlington, and Vicar of Bessingby, near Bridlington, by dispensation.
Yarborough, Rev. J. J. C., M.A., Curate of Chiselhurst, Kent; Vicar of Romsey, Hants.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brenan, Rev. Robert Hardy, M.A., Rector of St. Matthew's, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, at the Rectory, on the 5th inst.
Campion, Rev. W. J. H., Tutor of Keble College, at Oxford, on the 4th inst., aged 41.
Caparn, Rev. W. B., M.A., at Tauntfield House, Taunton, on the 10th inst., aged 74.
Earle, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Layer Breton, at 4, Dymock-road, Romford, on the 10th inst., aged 54.
Gaselee, Rev. John, M.A. Oxon, fifty-two years Rector of Little Yeldham, and forty years Rural Dean, at Great Linford Rectory, on the 4th inst., aged 86.
Martin, Rev. William George, M.A., at the Parsonage, Asylum-road, Peckham, on the 9th inst., aged 72.
Musgrave, Rev. William Peete, M.A., Canon-Residentiary of Hereford Cathedral for forty-seven years, and Warden of St. Katherine's, Ledbury, at the Residence House, Hereford, on the 11th inst., aged 78.
Ratcliffe, Rev. Thomas, B.D., at the Rectory, Fisherton Delamere, on the 5th inst., aged 81.
Stanley, Rev. Edward Marmaduke, M.A., late Vicar of Hillmorton, at Rugby, on the 8th inst., aged 83.
Tuck, Rev. John Johnson, M.A., at St. Ippolyt's, Hitchin, on the 7th inst., aged 81.
Tyler, Rev. Owen Blathwayte, M.A. Oxon, for forty-five years Vicar of North Wootton, Shepton Mallet, at the Vicarage, on the 5th inst., aged 71.
Wilkins, Rev. A. Drummond, Rector of Cattistock, Dorset, at the Rectory, on the 9th inst., aged 61.
Wheeler, Rev. Thomas L., at Bromwich House, Worcester, on the 8th inst., aged 86.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

TRUST IN GOD, THE SOURCE OF PEACE.

By The Rev. G. JANNINGS, M.A., Rector of Warmsworth.

Sermon Preached in Warmsworth Church, on February 14th., 1892.

"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee, because he trusteth in Thee."—Isaiah xxvi. 3.

WE confess with one mouth, every time that we meet for worship within these walls, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." This is the first principle of all religion, for as an Apostle says, "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." We all acknowledge the existence of God. It is only the fool who says (and he says it in his heart, not in his understanding), "There is no God." Our common sense may serve to teach us that the wonderful things which we see around us, the marvellous adaptation of means to certain definite ends which we behold on every side of us, could not have been the result of mere accident or chance. We cannot but be convinced that the abundant evidences of thought, which we see around us, imply a thinker, the existence, in short, of an intelligent person, who is alike all-powerful and all-wise. We all admit this to be true. No one here would for a moment deny that the world was in the beginning created and is still ruled and governed by Almighty God. We are all sincere in our profession of faith when we say, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." But although a firm belief in God's existence be the first principle of religion, it is only the first principle, and we must "leave the principles of the doctrine of Christ, and go on unto perfection," if we would attain the blessed state of the person described by the prophet in the text. Our faith must work by love, must develope into trust, and filial confidence in order that it may save our souls alive.

The Apostle St. James said to some in his day, who seem to have thought that belief in God's existence, and the acknowledgment of His sovereignty was all that they needed, "Thou believest that there is one God: thou doest well, the devils also believe and tremble;" and he goes on to show that a faith which leads to no good practical results is dead and would avail them nothing. And yet it must be feared that there are many professing Christians now who rest satisfied with this mere nominal and uninfluential faith.

And how can we reasonably expect that our minds should be kept in perfect peace, all our doubts resolved, all our fears removed, all our sorrows soothed, all our sins forgiven, if all that we know and care to know of God is that He is Almighty, the Maker of heaven and earth.

There is one little word in the opening sentence of the Apostle's creed which shows us what our faith in God ought to be, and what is the relation in which we ought to regard ourselves as standing towards Him, viz., that we are not merely His creatures, but His children. We do not say "I believe in God Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, but in God the Father Almighty." There can be no doubt that the word Father in the creed has primary reference to the place of God the Father in the ever blessed Trinity, into whose name every Christian is baptised. He is the Father in an especial sense of Jesus Christ, His only son, our Lord; but he is our Father, too, not only by creation, but by redemption. Even a heathen poet could say—St. Paul quoted his words in his discourse on Mars Hill, at Athens—"For we are also His offspring." He is our Father in that we owe Him our existence, our life and breath, all things, but we could not gather from creation alone that He loves us more than He loves the beasts which perish. Creation does no doubt bear witness to the being of God. As the Apostle St. Paul says, "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." But creation tells us little of the character of God, it leaves us entirely in the dark as to His purposes and intentions concerning us. Certainly it does show that God cares for His creatures and that His tender mercies are over all His works; but there are also dark sides to the picture. The dealings of divine providence are sometimes very mysterious, hard for us short-sighted mortals to reconcile with the idea of an Almighty Father who has the heart of a Father towards His creatures. By terrific accidents which man is unable to foresee, or to prevent, by convulsions of nature, such as storms and earthquakes, multitudes are sometimes hurried into eternity amid circumstances of appalling horror, and there seems to be none to care, no ear to hear the cry of the terror-stricken children of men.

The world goes on as it did before. The sun rises and sets, the seasons come and go, and these sad calamities, much more those who have miserably perished in them, are speedily forgotten. How sorely perplexed we should be by these things if we knew nothing more than creation can tell us of the character and love of God. But we know that He is our Father as well as our Creator. He has come near to us, and made

Himself one with us in the divine humanity of His only-begotten and well-beloved Son. One great part of the work and ministry of the Lord Jesus was the revelation of God as a Father who loves, and, for His dear Son's sake, is ready to forgive His sinful children. He spoke of God to His disciples as your heavenly Father, He taught them to address Him in prayer as "our Father which art in heaven," and He said in His own intercessory prayer on the eve of His sufferings for the sins of men: "I have manifested Thy name, *i.e.*, Thy paternal name —the name of Father unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world." Creation tells us much of the power and wisdom of God, but the Incarnation tells of His tenderness and love, reveals Him to us as a Father, who in spite of their sin and rebellion loves His creatures and His children with a love which passeth knowledge. The Incarnate Son has told us that there is a bright future in store for us, that He himself is gone to prepare a place for us, that where He is there we may be also, so that it matters little when or how we die, and under what circumstances of suddenness and horror, if only we know and believe the love which our heavenly Father bears us. The catastrophes which sometimes happen, and which fill our hearts with pity for the sufferers, and make us wonder perhaps sometimes why a God who is all-powerful and all good should permit His creatures to perish so miserably, make a great impression on our minds, but after all the numbers of those who are thus cut off suddenly is as nothing compared with the vast multitudes who daily succumb to wasting sickness, or the noisesome pestilence. We are thus continually reminded that this is not the place of our rest; that we have here no continuing city, and that it behoves us to be more diligent, earnest, in seeking one to come.

It is assuredly no light sin for us to be indifferent to the Fatherly love of God—to set no value on His exceeding great and precious promises—to have no other thoughts and feelings with regard to Him than such as we might be expected to have had, if He had not revealed to us His Fatherly love, if we knew not that He so loved the world of sinful men as to give His only begotten Son to become man, in order to save and redeem it, if all that we knew of Him were this, that He is "God Almighty, the Maker of heaven and earth."

Has he not a right to expect some return of love for the great love wherewith He hath first loved us? Can we suppose that He will be satisfied with that bare and cold acknowledgment of His existence and His power, which even the devils cannot refuse to yield?

He would do great things for us if we did not hinder Him by our hardness of heart and unbelief. He has done great things for us already, whereof we ought to rejoice. He that spared not His own Son, but freely gave Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things. We are not straightened in Him, but only in ourselves. We lose what we might possess and enjoy, because like God's people of old time we "give no credence unto His word and put not our trust in His help."

What a promise is this of the text to him who really puts his trust in the Lord, and whose mind is stayed upon his God. Thou wilt keep Him in perfect peace—a peace which the world cannot give, a peace which passeth all understanding will keep the heart and mind through Christ Jesus.

And is not this the very thing that we all need? To have our minds set at rest, to be at peace with God, to have an unfailing source of consolation under all our troubles, and to have the fear and the sting of death taken away. The world, even as its best, cannot supply all our wants, cannot give us all that our soul desires. It may amuse us for for a while, and when all goes well with us, may prevent us from feeling our need of this heavenly peace, but the time will surely come (when sorrow overtakes us, or sickness lays us low), when we shall feel that the world can do nothing for us, and that none but God can help us. And He is willing to be our Friend and Helper now. We have only to trust Him, and He will do it. We have only to let our minds be stayed on Him, and He will keep us in perfect peace.

There is the burden of sin, the dark catalogue of our many and great transgressions bearing witness against us, but if we trust in God and believe his gracious promises, we shall know that we have redemption through the blood of Christ, even the forgiveness of sins, and being thus justified by faith, we shall have "peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." And then there is the burden of care. How heavily does this burden press upon some of us. When losses befall us, when business does not prosper and resources fail, what a temptation to give way to despondency. The only remedy is trust in God and to "cast all our care upon Him," as He invites us to do, believing that He careth for us.

And what other solace can we look for in the sad hours of sorrow than trust in our heavenly Father, who is the God of all consolation and comfort. If our minds are stayed on Him, if we believe His gracious assurance that He does not afflict willingly, and that as many as He loves He rebukes and chastens, "we shall be able to glory in tribulations also," believing "that our light affliction, which is but for a moment," will be the means, under God, of "working out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

And then there is the great and unknown future awaiting us all, the veil which hides it from us is impenetrable. First one and then another, high and low, rich and poor; young and old, go hence, and are seen no more, and our turn will come ere long. How could we think seriously of such a

prospect and be at peace, if we knew nothing more than creation and nature and our own inborn instincts and aspirations can teach us of the things that shall be hereafter. But if we know that God is our Father and that He loves us, if we believe that Jesus died that we might live, that He might merit and purchase for us sinners a place in the many mansions of His Father's house, if our trust be in Him, we shall not be afraid. We shall be able to view the prospect of leaving all earthly things behind us without dismay, knowing that "we have in heaven a better and a more enduring substance," knowing that He who hath done such great things for us already has better things yet in store, and that the things which He hath prepared for them that love Him do indeed "exceed all that we can desire."

Perfect peace even here in this world of sin and sorrow, much more in the world to come, is the blessed portion of those who simply trust in the Lord and stay upon their God.

Peace, perfect peace, in this dark world of sin,
The blood of Jesus whispers peace within.

Peace, perfect peace, by thronging duties pressed,
To do the will of Jesus—this is rest.

Peace, perfect peace, with sorrows surging round,
On Jesus' bosom nought but calm is found.

Peace, perfect peace, our future all unknown,
Jesus we know, and He is on the throne.

Peace, perfect peace, death shadowing us and ours,
Jesus has vanquished death and all its powers.

It is enough, earth's struggles soon shall cease,
And Jesus call us to Heaven's perfect peace.

VIEWS OF SALVATION AS AFFECTING PRACTICE.

By the Rev. W. A. CUTTING, M.A., Vicar of Gayton, King's Lynn.

Notes of a Sermon Preached at Gayton Church in Lent, 1892.

"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."—Titus ii. 11-14.

MEN'S regard to religion must needs depend on or be deflected by what is thought of salvation.

1. There is the view, the popular view of salvation, from Hell into Heaven, but especially from Hell, as fear is stronger than hope.

"Nothing is worth a thought beneath,
But how I may escape the death
That never, never dies.
How make my own salvation sure,
And, when I fail on earth, secure
A mansion in the skies."

This reduces salvation to self-interest—the highest self-interest indeed, but self-interest still, so that if no wrath to come, no religion either. An extreme case was the criminal condemned to die, penitent and pious seeming, but who, finding himself reprieved, flung down the Bible with an oath, and religion away with it. But a case not extreme is the too frequent one of devoutness when death threatens, but if there be respite, a return sooner or later to the world. The religion resulting from this view is apt to be intense, zealous for "plucking brands from the burning," but hard, narrow, compatible with a keen regard to self-interest in this world also.

But apart from "wrath to come," that is if we were sinless beings, religion, in the sense of God to worship and His creatures to serve, would remain in fullest force.

2. There is the view that while Heaven or Hell is indeed before us everyone, yet all who are baptised are called to a state of salvation, in which they may keep themselves by Holy Communion and other means of grace, and then may walk at liberty in business or pleasure, as men whose religious duty is done, or who hold that God is served not less in our useful pursuits and recreating pastimes than in religious exercises.

In practice this may degenerate into "the form of godliness without the power," men and women "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," yet punctilious communicants.

3. There is yet a third view of salvation bordering on universalism. "No Hell," a seafaring man was heard to say, "except what a bad man may have in his own breast." "Of the Heavenly kingdom," says one, "the privilege in becoming general has become insignificant. As teachers have opened its gates wider and wider, the sense of relief in gaining its walls is fading away. The belief that salvation is an absolutely common benefit passes into a belief of nothing to be saved from." Or men are thinking, if not saved here, they may be hereafter, may have another chance after death. And if another, why not, on the same principle, yet another—say after a term of punishment, and so on and so on? Even the Roman doctrine of purgatory is not that. That doctrine is that souls are lost or saved in this life, but that if saved, *i.e.*, if not dying in mortal sin, they are sure to need further purgation before being fit for Heaven, and this they get between death and resurrection, a process in which they may be helped by prayers and masses on earth on their behalf.

That loose, vague, sentimental view of salvation is very pleasant to flesh and blood, but utterly inconsistent with the stern, strenuous urgency of Scripture, about "fleeing for refuge," "running the race," "fighting the battle," "passing our sojourning here in fear," "being diligent," "giving all diligence," "what shall be the end of them

that obey not the Gospel?" "how escape, if we neglect so great salvation?"

In truth, religion is in this world complicated by sin. We have sinful souls to save as well as a God to glorify. Religion for man must needs be first reconciliation with God—salvation, not from Hell only or simply, but from sin. The very state of salvation to which baptism calls us is not final or finished salvation; it is salvation to be "worked out with fear and trembling." That is, "the end of religion being less happiness than character,"—make happiness our end, even in things earthly, and we miss it: pleasures themselves by themselves become a weariness: make duty and service our end, and happiness will come or "be added": even so it is in things divine. There is nothing very soul-elevating or soul-refining in the thought of "pleasures for evermore" merely as pleasures; but "in the keeping of God's commandments there is great reward." Virtue, and self-conquest and service of God and man, in one word, holiness, brings solid, lasting, growing happiness both here and hereafter.

Well, and if religion be for us complicated by sin, it is neither the simple homage to God which a sinless being would pay, nor the mere escape from pains and penalties. It is homage to God accompanied with repentance and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ as having "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," issuing in "strivings against sin" and after "righteousness of life." It is not escaping Hell by any other means than salvation from the sin which incurs it. In the words of the text, "The salvation-bringing grace of God teaches us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we live soberly (in self-discipline), righteously (towards man) and godly (towards our Maker) in this present world (of probation, temptation, opportunity), looking for that blessed hope"—

A light to shine upon the road

—"the appearing" (as in v. 11 of "the grace," so now) "of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us"—not to make it safe to sin, with always His blood to fly to, even to the last moment of life if not before—but "to redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to Himself a peculiar people," "a people for His own possession," "zealous of good works." And then the first part of the chapter has drawn out for several sorts and conditions of Christian men and women in detail, the "good works which God has prepared for them to walk in." "These things speak and exhort and reprove with all authority."

THE Bishop of Liverpool has, it is stated, appointed the Rev. Reginald S. Bartram to the charge of Haydock parish, pending the appointment of a vicar, in the place of the Rev. J. C. Cater, whose nomination has been vetoed by the Archbishop of York for reasons stated in our last issue.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1892.

CRUSHED.

EIGHT killed, and a score or so wounded, is the net result of the Bank Holiday battle of Hampstead Heath. It is rather above the average slaughter of a fight in one of our little wars; and to-day people are asking, not unnaturally, "Who is to blame?"

Some say the victims, and it is no doubt culpable to crush yourself to death, when you ought to be enjoying yourself. Some say the men who planned the staircase, and no doubt the accident would never have happened if the staircase had been about five times the width that was wanted. Some say the ticket collectors; and it is quite plain that if there had been no tickets collected that day the holiday people would have achieved their journey with less disaster, and, we may surmise, at less expense.

But when all this is granted, we are still far from the truth. People must have holidays, crowds must collect, and we cannot expect railway directors to have a Giant's Causeway at every suburban station, and to dispense with tickets on all Bank Holidays. The conductor must go on "punching in the presence of the passenjare," and if the passengers insist on punching one another in the process, it is not the conductor's fault.

The moral of this tragedy is a good deal further to seek. The truth is that Bank Holiday, conceived as a boon and a blessing to men, is rapidly becoming quite the reverse. Every day the struggle for life gets keener. Working hours grow longer, and the reaction becomes more and more violent when the pressure of the chain is temporarily removed. There is something of ferocity in the way the working man enjoys himself on the three or

four days in the year which are wrung reluctantly from toil, and this is still more evident in the case of working women. Women comprise the great majority of Bank Holiday crowds, as any observer may see for himself. The man as a rule goes no further than the round of the public-houses in his immediate neighbourhood. By the time he has finished that he is usually unable to go anywhere at all, not even to bed. It is the woman, condemned to longer hours, and poorer pay, and harder servitude, who is wild for change, fresh air, excitement, anything outside her ordinary conditions of existence. And it is the children, just as eager to escape from Board Schools and Government inspectors, who are her companions in the dissipation, the discomfort, the disorder, and too often in the disaster which accompanies Bank Holiday.

Of the eight killed at Hampstead Heath last Monday, two were women, and the rest children. Of the fourteen or so injured, we believe only one was a grown man. Eloquent facts. So long as such Bank Holidays continue, disasters of this kind will grow more, not less frequent. What we want is more holidays, and not so many Bank Holidays. If we could arrive at some system by which every man, woman, or child who works could claim every week some few hours which they could call their own, they would be able to make a rational use of them, and to get some real enjoyment and benefit out of them which they cannot out of the orgie of a Bank Holiday. Too many people are let loose at once; they are let loose too long and at too great intervals. Those who are not crushed or smothered are either worn out, cross or drunk, and the fact which every employer and every workman knows that Easter Tuesday, Whit Tuesday, to say nothing of Wednesday and Thursday, are invariably spent in recovering from the effects of Easter Monday and Whit Monday, is the very worst condemnation of what is tragically miscalled Bank Holiday.

ENGLISH AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS.

A Paper, by the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester Cathedral.

Many articles have been appearing lately in the monthly reviews on the condition and prospects of the labouring class in country parishes. Amongst these the one that has most interested me is that by Mr. Tuckwell, in the March number of the *Contemporary Review*. It is interesting both on account of the truths that it contains, and also on account of its numerous exaggerations. I propose, with your permission, to keep this article in view, to correct Mr. Tuckwell's exaggerations, and, I trust, to escape the danger of adding misrepresentations of my own. At least, there will be no sensational writing, no "harrowing pictures," and no "bitter cries." And the writer can confidently say that he has no political or ecclesiastical interests to subserve.

I cannot claim, like Mr. Tuckwell, to have visited every county, and almost every constituency. But I have lived among agricultural labourers for forty-eight years of life (1844-1892), have served them in six counties, have observed their lives, trained their children, enjoyed their friendship, and received their confidences. Deeper and more solid knowledge is thus gained than by the study of Blue-books, which only cite striking, and therefore exceptional cases, or by tours of political agitation, which only place the tourist in contact with the discontented.

Mr. Tuckwell speaks of "the existing wretchedness, which submerges at least a moiety of our rural population." This is a tremendous exaggeration. It is far from being their own view of their own case. If we talk to an old labourer, or labourer's wife, who can remember the state of things fifty years ago, he tells us of the vast improvement which has taken place in the condition of his class, through the increase of wages and the cheapening of all the necessaries of life. He is very fairly contented with things as they are, and feels no more aggrieved by the superior positions of his squire and parson than we ourselves are discontented because life has not furnished us with the wealth and other advantages of a Duke of Westminster or a Baron Rothschild. The younger generation, whose views have been widened by education, are apt to aspire to improved conditions of life, as they have a right to do; but their present lives are not rightly described as miserable, nor themselves as unhappy.

The grievances of agricultural labourers are summed up by Mr. Tuckwell in three points—their wretched homes, their insufficient incomes, and their want of personal freedom.

The homes are said to be in general in bad sanitary condition, and to afford insufficient space for health and decency. Now the fact is, that, on the large properties in England, the cottages are, with few exceptions, in good condition, provided with as much sleeping accommodation as the labourer is willing to use, and let at a very moderate rent. It has, for many past years, been a point of honour with the squires (properly so called) to remodel and improve their labourers' dwellings. The unwholesome houses still remaining have been built, by small investors, on scraps of land, usually in rows, with no gardens or very small ones, and often with very bad sanitary arrangements. The proprietors of these are, in many cases, needy men, heavily mortgaged, who cannot wait for their rents, nor afford to carry out improvements or even necessary repairs. It is quite true that many of these small proprietors are still able, through their influence with the rural sanitary authorities, to set at defiance the regulations of the law. Jobbery is still rife in Boards of Guardians; and, as human nature is not likely to be regenerated by political regulations transferring power to a poorer and therefore more corruptible class, it is to be feared that the district and parish councils of the future will not be altogether free from the same evils. To render homes sanitary and decent in rural places, all that is now required is the enforcement of existing laws.

I leave sanitary matters to those medical and other authorities whose duty it is to deal with them. Confining myself to the moral point of view, I find that my experience teaches me that the philanthropic mind has gone entirely astray with regard to the demoralising effects of overcrowding. When I read a

paragraph like the one appended in a note,* I conclude at once that the author of it has no intimate acquaintance with the rural labouring class, or he would not have written the grievous slander upon them which it contains. There is no incest among them. I have ransacked my long memory, and I cannot remember even a suspicion of immoral relations between members of the same family, except in two cases. In each of these a man had seduced the daughter by a former marriage of his wife—in one case during that wife's lifetime, in the other after her death. In the latter case it was solitude, not overcrowding, that gave occasion to the incest. I cannot recall to mind the household arrangements in the other case, which happened about forty years ago. The fact is, that the immoralities which prevail too widely among the agricultural classes are of an entirely different kind from those which Mr. Tuckwell suggests, and are in no way connected with overcrowded bedrooms. They are almost confined to what is sometimes called the *prægustatio matrimonii*—an offence towards which old divines of the English Church were unduly lenient; and our population of to-day is suffering morally from the laxity of their former teachers. Young people of the two sexes begin to keep company very early; they take long walks together before and after dark, which furnish opportunities for temptation. The relations between the sexes do not become dangerous until the couples begin to pair off *solus cum solâ*, which cannot occur in crowded homes. Much more vice takes place in and about roomy farm-houses, where young servants have frequent opportunites of being alone together, than in the most crowded labourers' cottages. In the crowded home the children pass the night, as well as the day, under the closest superintendence of their parents. And the fathers and mothers of the labouring class are quite as anxious about their children as are their superiors, and by no means capable of tolerating incestuous vice, even if the idea of such a crime were to occur, which it does not. Nor need there be the indelicacy which the imperfectly informed superior classes suspect. The agricultural classes go to bed weary, and rise with the day. There is no *tubbing* in the labourer's bedroom, and what ablutions take place are performed at the sink downstairs. Nor do the inmates retire to rest in the complete *déshabillé* which prevails in the upper and middle classes. Thus they can sleep within a short distance of each other with not much more indecency than in the case of those six, or it may be ten, people of opposite sexes, who pass the night together in a full railway carriage. Generally, the sexual morality of the agricultural labourers is not inferior to that prevailing in the upper and middle classes. There is hardly any prostitution. Adultery is more uncommon than in the fashionable world. The wives are universally faithful to their husbands, and the husbands generally to their wives. The one great reproach and disgrace of the class is that form of laxity which has been already mentioned. If all would-be philanthropists, and especially persons of influence, clerical and lay, would, instead of tilting at imaginary evils, attack this really existing one, their efforts might result in a general elevation of the standard of morals, self-respect, and honour, in the whole labouring class. There is a way of checking the evil, and raising public opinion with respect to it, which the present writer has found successful, and which, if he were not afraid of appearing like a quack recommending his nostrum, he would offer to communicate.

The next point treated by Mr. Tuckwell is the inadequate income of the labourer, which is placed at an average of 15s. 8d. per week, including harvest and other occasional earnings, and is said to lead to the following effects:—"The household food is stinted, the children go hungry to school, the new baby is born weakly and half-nourished, the mother recovers from her confinement on milkless tea with bread and lard, the father dulls his stomach's craving with doctored beer and spirits at the public-house." This is one of those "harrowing pictures" which professed philanthropists should carefully avoid. The principal remedy suggested is, that the agricultural labourer should postpone marriage until, by means of the facilities provided by some future Act of Parliament, he has been enabled to make a landed investment out of his savings, and to build a home for his future family. But this suggestion betrays an imperfect acquaintance with the conditions under which the agricultural labourer has to lay out his life.

An early marriage, if his help-mate be well chosen, is the most prudent step that a young labourer can take, because, if he marries early, he may reckon on his children being all brought up, and the hardest struggle of life concluded, before his own strength for labour begins to fail. The wife of his youth will be his best helper, and will furnish him with children who will be to him like the arrows in the hand of the strong man. It is a gross slander on the country girls to call them "shiftless, untrained slovens." Some such may, no doubt, be found among them, but they are the exception, not the rule. In general, they have been trained in the stern school of necessity to economise every penny and every crust. They are never wasteful, as the better-paid factory hands and colliers' wives and daughters often are. Let us picture to ourselves the life of a rural labouring couple as it really exists.

We will suppose them married at 21 or 22, the man earning (as was said before) an average wage of 15s. 8d, including harvest gains. This is much more than enough to maintain a thrifty pair. For the first four or five years the wife will have a considerable, though diminishing, amount of leisure time, which she will employ in taking in washing or needlework, in charing half or quarter days at neighbouring houses, or in field employments. The old cottage industries of lace-making, straw-plaiting, hand-loom weaving, once a great resource for the employment of unoccupied time, have unhappily become extinct. That man or woman would confer untold blessings on rural parishes who could succeed in reviving some of these.

By some of these means, if the man has not been too profuse in his expenditure on beer and 'bacco, money will have been saved to help the family through the difficult period of eight or nine years which is to follow, when the wife has no longer any time to spare from home, and all the children are still small, while the whole money income is still the husband's wages. But by the thirteenth or fourteenth year of the marriage that hard time will be beginning to pass away. The children will, one by one, be getting into work. Almost every year there will be a fresh bread-winner in the family, and the joint income will be rising year by year. The parents will have the benefit of the earnings of their

* "While the young ones are infantine, overcrowding means unhealthiness; indecency, as sexual consciousness supervenes; when puberty is reached, inevitable incest."

children for some eight or ten years. Then the young ones will marry in early youth like their parents, and will migrate from their old home. When they have all left the nest, or have become able to provide for themselves, the parents will be middle-aged people, still under fifty, with many years yet before them, in which they will still have strength to labour for themselves, and make provision for the time of their actual decrepitude.

I have been supposing that the family has no regular income to begin with, except the husband's wages. But that is very rarely the case. Usually there is a cottage garden, or allotment, producing corn, vegetables, and fruit, for consumption or sale, and affording opportunity of keeping a pig or poultry. Mr. Tuckwell speaks as if allotments were exceptional things and novelties; but, in fact, they are rather old institutions. The present writer has himself laid out three allotment fields—one in a Midland and two in a Northern county—the most recent in 1853. Even at that early date the system was general in the Midlands, though almost unknown in the North, where indeed there was no demand for it. The introducer of the system was, generally, the parson, and the rents charged then, as now, were the usual agricultural ones, with a small addition to cover rates and taxes, which the landlord always took upon himself. The allotment is an unmixed blessing to the labourer, and it is desirable that it should be placed within the reach of all, without limitation of the extent of land to be occupied. A man who has made a small plot of land answer ought to have the opportunity of taking more.

If possible, no recourse should be had to compulsion, for which at present there is a mania, but whose only effect would be to propagate ill-feeling, and to furnish opportunities for local spite. I think that Mr. Chaplin is quite right in refusing a power to build houses on small allotments; for such privilege must necessarily result in the creation of congested districts like those in Ireland. As far as possible, the ancient rights of pasturage for cottagers' cows on common or waste land should be revived, for the cow is the labourer's most valuable ally in his struggle to rear a young family, and to improve his position in life.

I will not linger on the want of freedom, of which Mr. Tuckwell complains, for that is a thing of the past. Power has migrated, with the franchise, into the hands of the agricultural labourers; and it only remains for them to realise their position, and to formulate their demands.

We must now direct our thoughts towards the future. What will the agricultural labourers do, when they have become thoroughly conscious that power in rural districts has passed finally into their hands, and that they actually hold the balance between the two great parties in the State? It is probable that they will use their power with great moderation. There will be no *jacquerie*, no *guerre aux chateaux*. They do not hate either the squire or the parson. For the former, if he be of ancient lineage, or if, though a new man, he has won their hearts by that open-handed liberality with which the upstart often supplies the defect in his blood, they have a deep and sincere respect; and, in the latter, though they see through that mere ecclesiasticism which is, for the moment, dominant in the Church, yet they appreciate highly every disinterested effort that he makes to do them good. They have in their modes of thought a strong aristocratical undercurrent, and an innate ancestral conservatism. Hence, they will neither want to disestablish the parson nor to dispossess the squire, but will use their power silently, sedately, cautiously, patiently, half-unconsciously, but at the same time perseveringly, for the improvement of their own condition. And immediate benefits, such as will tell directly on themselves, will always have the greatest attraction for their limited parochial minds, which are not capable of taking in wider views of the greater interests of the State and the Empire. And herein lies the great danger of the present situation of affairs. Power has been placed in the hands of men whose ideas are limited to self, family, and parish; and professional agitators, baser, and more selfish than themselves, are continually urging them to think and care for these objects alone. It is the egotism and party spirit of the politicians, who are bidding against each other for the agricultural vote, and who spare nothing in the way of falsehood and cajolery, which is most likely to mar the bright prospect of gradual and solid improvement which now lies in front of the agricultural labourer.

Whatever democratic parochial institutions may be eventually established, the chief part in the improvement and elevation of the agricultural labourers must still rest with the squires. There is much in the present position of these landed proprietors which moves our pity; for the reverses which are overtaking them are the punishment, not of their own personal faults, but of those of their forefathers. Most of the present squires do their duty to their tenantry, and many of them live like a beneficent earthly providence amongst them. But the errors of their class in past generations have had grievous effects upon the country. During the time of their undisputed ascendency, when all legislation, as well as all local power, was in their hands, the landed proprietors gradually absorbed all the rights which the labourers once possessed. The commons were enclosed, so that, in most counties, hardly an acre of free ground anywhere remains. The poor have no longer free fuel from the woods, where such exist. Even the gleanings of the fields are no longer left to those who have no fields of their own. I can remember the time when a Conservative Parliament inserted in a Highway Act a clause which prohibited the cow of the cottager from grazing on the waste land by the way-side, because it incommoded the carriages of the upper class in their drives along the lanes. I knew the cottagers whose right was thus taken from them, and who had therefore to sell their cow, and watch the grass growing to waste, which had once added so much to their comfort; and I can remember the idea occurring to me at the time, that, now that this last poor fragment of his native soil had been taken from the labourer, the nemesis must fall, and a reaction set in. That reaction, and that nemesis have come at last, but after what a number of years! I could also quote examples in which, though the acts themselves were beyond the range of my experience, having taken place about sixty years ago, yet the actors were known to me, in which persons were ejected by lords of the manor from cottages and gardens, which their forefathers had been permitted to build and enclose for themselves on the parish wastes, and had occupied rent-free for more than one generation, and for many scores of years, and which, therefore, had become legally their own. But all the actors in these acts of violence have long departed this life; and it is better to let the dead rest.

Even where no infraction of personal right was committed, the policy pursued by past generations of squires has tended to produce or aggravate the evils

of which we now complain. In the day of their wealth and power they bought out all the small independent landowners around them. They were never satisfied until, within the ring fence of their properties, they possessed all the land, and with it all the power. So omnipotent were they that it never seemed to occur to them that a time might come when they would need the support of those natural allies whom they were then extinguishing. Had they been content to be each the first among a numerous body of independent men, their successors would have found themselves now, when evil times have overtaken them, surrounded by supporters, all as jealous of the rights of property as themselves. There is no Conservative so intense as the small proprietor when his property is threatened; and these, had they not gone out of existence, would have stood by the squire in every parliamentary election and every local contest. But now, each large landed proprietor finds himself absolutely alone on his broad acres, without a single man, directly interested in the maintenance of property except himself.

Immense mischief was also done by the policy so generally adopted on large estates about a century ago, and not discontinued until very recent years, of merging the small holdings into large farms. The effect of this policy has been to remove the ladder on the steps of which the industrious labourer could once climb upwards into the class of farmers, and to sever the agricultural population into two classes, entirely separate from, and in many villages bitterly hostile to each other, as proved by frequent acts of incendiarism, which are the discontented labourers' revenge upon the farmers.*

The question now arises, Is it possible for the landed proprietors to provide themselves again with these natural allies, whom their forefathers, in their blindness, extinguished? This is the work that the more enlightened among them are now desiring and attempting. It is well worth while trying the experiment, for in its success not merely the interests of the landowners, but the prosperity and happiness of rural England are involved; but it is very difficult. A race of peasant proprietors cannot be extemporised. A sad truth is contained in the often-quoted saying that—

> "A bold peasantry, its country's pride,
> When once destroyed, can never be supplied."

Never is too pessimistic a word, which we naturally shrink from using, but much time and many efforts will be required before English villages can be filled again with a population of independent men. Nothing less is needed from the squires than a complete reversal of their whole past policy. Hitherto they have striven to destroy independence: henceforth they must labour to restore it. They must begin by laying to heart the truth that their properties were not made for themselves alone, to be the source of their incomes and the playground for their amusements, but for the other inhabitants also. If each of them would examine the register, that is kept in the safe of his parish church, he would find that most of the labouring families now existing were already settled on the ground when registration first commenced in the middle of the sixteenth century, and therefore have as good a right to a home in their native parish as he has himself. Let him resolve to aid as many of them as possible in procuring for themselves a home, which shall be independently their own. The course to be pursued is easily traced in outline, though the details are full of difficulties. The first step in the upward progress of the labourer can never be the purchase of a freehold, for he has no means for paying even the first instalment of the price. He must begin by hiring land, first in the form of an allotment, and after that he must have tenancies provided, graduated, large and small, so as to form a series of steps, upon which an enterprising and industrious man may ascend from lower to higher grades. It must be remembered that the labourer starts in life with no capital except his own labour and the small economies that he may have effected out of his wages. If he had not been deprived of the village commons, and even of the way-side wastes, he might have begun, as he often used to do, by the purchase of a cow-calf, which he would have reared to maturity, and which would have in due time brought him increase. He would have pastured this animal on the waste for some months in summer, have provided her with straw, roots, and a green crop from his allotment, and have constructed for her a shed of wattle-and-daub in his garden at little expense beyond the labour of his own spare time. Her milk would have helped to rear his children in health, and her other produce would have been money in his pocket, which would have afforded him a stepping-stone for a further rise. This first step, which is the most essential of all, has been rendered impossible by the enclosure of commons and wastes. An intelligent and philanthropic squire will replace it by placing a number of very small holdings within the reach of labouring men. Those who have prospered in these must have the opportunity of obtaining larger ones. When money has been thus gained, as it would be by thrifty, laborious men, then would come the time for the purchase of a small freehold, if such were made easily accessible. But to offer a freehold to a labourer in his present condition is an entirely illusory boon, which very few indeed would venture to accept. The only villagers who could at present purchase would be the tradesmen—joiner, blacksmith, bricklayer, baker, grocer, and perhaps, readiest of all, the publican. In every case letting of land must come before purchase. By means like these a generous and enlightened squire, resolved to help his people to become independent instead of keeping them dependent, might make the inhabitants of his domain prosperous and happy, and thereby acquire an influence over them far preferable to his lost despotic power, and far more salutary to them.

The last point to be considered is the part that the parson may take in the regeneration of rural England. Mr. Tuckwell supposes, and in this a writer in the *Nineteenth Century* agrees with him, that this unfortunate cleric is bitterly hated by the labouring class. In a few cases this may be true, and, where it is so, it is the parson's own fault; but such bitter feelings are by no means general. It is, indeed, a melancholy fact, that the average rector or vicar has less influence over the mind of the agricultural labourer than any other rural clergyman that now exists, or that ever existed. The fundamental cause of this powerlessness

* The change from the small into the large culture, which has been so disastrous to the rural districts, took place, I believe, chiefly in the latter part of the last century. About forty-five years ago a small farmer, eighty years of age, with a long memory, told me that in his father's time there were, in a small village in the Midlands, well known to him and me, thirteen heads of families, all holding land and keeping teams of horses, while then (as now) there were only two large grazing farms, and only five dwellings, remaining. A similar change took place in a great number of rural parishes.

is that he either is, or affects to be, of another, and that a superior class to the labourers, and therefore is felt by them to have interests, ideas, and sympathies different from theirs, to be governed by a different public opinion, and to live in a different world. This defect has existed for many generations in the English clergy. And the wave of sacerdotalism that has passed over them in the last fifty years has widened the difference, by instilling into them an additional set of ideas which their people do not share, and by leading them to advance pretensions for their office and their ceremonial, which seem unrealities to those hard, realistic minds with which they have to deal. Men, like George Eliot's Mr. Gilfil, with no theology and little ceremonial, with no pretensions of any kind, and with hardly any clerical equipment except an abundance of benevolence and common sense, were a greater power for good than the present generation of theologically-trained and æsthetically-attired priests. The clerical mind needs to be recalled from dogma—which, being an attempt to express in definite terms that which is infinite, and therefore undefinable and inexpressible in human language, is quite beyond the reach of man—and from ceremonial—which has no basis, because no visible or tangible effects, in the facts of human life,—and from Church interests—which are only a larger kind of selfishness—to an object which is quite attainable and quite practical, perfectly unselfish and therefore perfectly Christian, the moral improvement and elevation of the people. If the clergyman rightly understood his office, he would see that it is for this that he exists, and that it is a far higher and nobler object than those which occupy most clerical minds.

It is as an aid to moral elevation that material improvement of the labourer's condition falls within the department of the clergy. In their present state of impoverishment they can directly do but little. They may, indeed, lay out allotment fields, as their predecessors did forty or fifty years ago, but they can hardly afford to cut up their glebes into the small holdings which the labourers now require; yet their influence is still great with the higher and middle classes by whom the work of material improvement must be done.

In this present age of ecclesiastical movements and agitations it seems hopeless to invite the clergy to abandon frankly and entirely the pursuit of Church interests, as being only a gratification of the sectarian self; yet this is the form of self-denial that is urgently required from them. As the squire must sacrifice the egotism of the *grand seigneur*, and surround himself with the largest possible number of men materially free and independent, so must the parson sacrifice the exclusive pretensions of the priest, encourage the multiplication of free moral and spiritual workers, and ally himself with all who, under whatever denomination, are working for the moral improvement of the people. The less he attempts to quell or dominate these, the greater will be his influence over them, and the better will be his hopes of bearing an effective part in the regeneration of rural England.

A LETTER has been received in Boston from Lady Watkin (formerly Mrs. Ingram) intimating that, instead of asking for a public vote to elect a vicar of Boston, she had asked the Bishop of Lincoln to make the selection, and his lordship has selected the Rev. John Stephenson, vicar of St. Thomas's, Toxeth-park, Liverpool.

THE BOOK OF ARMAGH.

BY THE LATE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM REEVES, D.D., LL.D., M.B., PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY, HON. MEM. SOC. ANTIQ., SCOT. AND ZURICH, BISHOP OF DOWN, CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

(*Continued from page* 191.)

IN 1707, Edward Lhuyd, the famous Welsh philologist, published his Archæologia Britannica, in preparing the materials for which he had been for some time in communication with old Roderic O'Flaherty, and other Irish scholars, as well as collectors of books. In his catalogue of Irish MSS. he gives, at page 436, the titles of twelve which he had seen in the possession of Arthur Brownlow, of Lurgan Clun Brasil, but makes no mention of the book of Armagh. However, he adds, that in a letter lately received from Ireland he obtained a list of seventeen more, but without notice of their depository, and among them, first in order, is LEABHAR ARDA MACHA, no doubt the book under consideration; for although Keating, in his History of Ireland, applies this name, which signifies in Irish "Book of Armagh," to a totally different compilation, as Fleming, in his Collectanea, does, the Latin equivalent, *Codex Armachanus*; it is certain that the book so named to Lhuyd was our manuscript. This will appear from the letter just now to be cited. Lhuyd died in 1709; but previously he had obtained full information on the subject of this book, and the following description, transmitted from Ireland, which is found among his papers (nearly all, alas! since destroyed by fire, while in a binder's hands), was communicated by the Right Honourable Charles William Wynne to the Rev. Doctor O'Conor, who, in 1814, presented it to the public in the first volume of his "Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores:"

"This manuscript, beyond all question, is exceedingly ancient, whether written in part by the hand of St. Patrick himself (as stated at the foot of folio 24), or, as appears to me more probable, the work of a later age. And possibly it is that *Textus Evangeliorem*, which St. Bernard, in the Life of Malachi, reckons among the insignia of the See, and states to have been St. Patrick's own Text. By Ussher and Ware it is designated the Book of Armagh, but by the natives 'The Book of the Canons of St. Patrick;' being so termed, I suppose, from the Canons of the Gospel Harmonies, which commence at folio 26. This book was in old times held in great esteem by the native Irish, so much so, that the family commonly called *MacMaor*, in English *MacMoyre*, borrowed their name from having the custody of it. For *Maor* in Irish is 'Keeper;' and the whole family was, without distinction, called *Maor na Ccanon*, or 'Keeper of the Canons.' From an early time they held under the See of Armagh eight townlands in the county [of Armagh], called the lands of BalliMoyre, in virtue of the safe custody of this book. In whose hands this book remained for many ages past, till Florentine MacMoyre went over to England in the year of grace 1680, to give evidence, untrue, I fear, against Oliver Plunket, Doctor of Theology, and Archbishop of this kingdom in the Roman communion, who was hanged at London, though undeservedly, as is believed. Moyre, being in want of money at the time of his departure, left the book in pawn as a security for five pounds sterling. It very acceptably came into the

hands of Arthur Brownlow, who, not without much labour, arranged in their proper order the leaves, which were at the time displaced, wrote the numbers at the head of the pages to mark the leaves, added others in the margin to distinguish the chapters, and took care when they were so arranged to have them securely stitched in their old cover, in the condition in which it now appears, and made the whole be kept in the ancient case, together with a Bull of a Roman Pontiff which was found in company with it," etc.

From the above-named Arthur Brownlow, of Lurgan, it descended, in 1710, to his son William ; from him, in 1739, to his son William ; from him, in 1794, to his son William ; from him, in 1815, to his half-brother and residuary legatee, the Rev. Francis Brownlow ; and from him, in 1847, to his eldest son William, its last possessor in this family.

In 1827, Sir William Betham, having previously obtained a loan of the manuscript through Archbishop Magee, drew public attention to its history and contents in his "Antiquarian Researches," where, mingled with much that is flagrantly incorrect and unscholarlike, he published an account which created considerable interest at the time. After this it remained for awhile in the hands of Richard Moore Tims, the bookseller, in Grafton Street ; and, in 1831, with the arrangements for the sale of the valuable and extensive library of Edward Woods, Esq., by Mr. Maguire, the auctioneer, in Suffolk Street, this manuscript was offered to the public, and an account of it, under the head "Book of Armagh, Unique," was printed at the commencement of the catalogue, being chiefly borrowed from Sir William Betham's memoir. Public attention was drawn to it by the following notice in "Saunders' News-Letter" of Monday, June 6th, 1831 :—"We have been gratified with the sight of this singularly rare manuscript ; public curiosity has been strongly excited by its appearance. Hundreds of visitors have called during the last ten days at Mr. Maguire's sale rooms, for the purpose of inspecting the Book, which was held in so much veneration by our ancestors. We understand it will be sold on to-morrow. We trust those more immediately connected with our public institutions will look to it, and not allow so precious a document to quit the country. It appears to be the general feeling that the heads of our University should not allow the book to pass into other hands, in which opinion we most cordially agree." And, strange to say, the book is now safely lodged in the Library of Trinity College, but not in consequence of this suggestion, nor by any outlay on the part of the recipients. When the day of sale came, the book was bought in by the owner, and while the hammer lost a victim, the country was saved a literary sacrifice, for to England the book would have gone. It was afterwards very generously placed at the service of literary persons ; Doctor Petrie had the use of it, and in 1844 it was in the hands of the late W. J. Monck Mason. Some interesting extracts from it had appeared in the May number of the "Christian Examiner" for 1836, and its value and importance were now very generally acknowledged. The most important step, however, in making its contents available, was in 1846, when, at a General Meeting of the Royal Irish Academy, on the 8th of June, the President announced that the Rev. Francis Brownlow had deposited this ancient manuscript in their museum, with the understanding that it should be taken due care of, and returned to the owner on demand.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." April, 1892. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

PROFESSOR CHEYNE finishes his review of Canon Driver's "Introduction," but we are inclined to be more hopeful about these papers than we were last month. Their extravagance must surely disgust every one who has not wholly lost his wits about the most childish theory of this most childish age. And Prof. Cheyne's delight in destruction reminds us of nothing so much as the delight of a child who has got a smashing fit on, and is having a really good time of it amongst his toys.

From Professor Cheyne to Dean Chadwick is indeed from Philip drunk to Philip sober.

His remarks are really an expansion of Neander's thoughtful saying (which he quotes), that Christ's miracles are really a part of His humiliation.

Dr. Sanday continues his review of the Johannean Question. Is it worth while to pay so much deference to Mr. Cross' opinions ? We think not. The fourth paper is by Mr. Smith on the "Geography of the Holy Land."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION *VERSUS* AIONIAL PURGATORY.

SIR,—"J. B.'s" perplexity in endeavouring to understand my letter of April 2nd is easily accounted for. It seems limited to the question, or rather to half the question, I asked him in my first paragraph. His perplexity arises from his dividing my question in two and trying to answer the latter half without taking the former into consideration.

My question, slightly modified so as to make it unmistakably plain to "J. B." is this : "J. B." says "he has been reading the Bible all his life, and can say with truth that no passage has ever suggested to him extinction of being." How, in that case I ask him, did anything in my letter of March 19th suggest to him that I hold "the doctrine of annihilation or extinction of being ?" The expressions I used were, I may say, all Scripture expressions which he has been reading in the Bible all his life. Reading them in the Bible they never suggested to him extinction of being. Reading them in my letter they do so all at once. I ask him, how is that ? Did I juggle with them or quote them unfairly or use them improperly ? This is a plain question, and I do not think it can be considered an impertinent one ; it ought to get a plain answer.

As to the eloquent passage he quotes from his book, the "Complete Triumph of Moral Good over Evil," I may say (1) that I believe in that complete triumph quite as firmly as he does. (2.) That it seems to me to have nothing to do with the question between him and me except in the first two lines, where the "training of intelligent beings for an endless existence" being assumed, is a very glaring *petitio principii ;* if, as I suppose, he means that *all* intelligent human beings are being trained for that end. (3.) Though he does not say to which of the two

modes of training he inclines, I rather think it is the second. But if he means that God adopts and uses one of these modes and not the other, I think he is clearly mistaken. For certainly some die in the Lord and enter on their "endless existence" of eternal blessedness without being "exposed to raging passions, vices, and crimes—to agony, darkness, horror and despair," and have "kindly, gentle, and benevolent feelings" cultivated in them by quite other means, while some attain to that endless existence of joy and felicity after a terrible exposure to more or less of "J. B.'s" second mode of training.

I am much obliged by "J. B.'s" answer to my question as to whether he believes—as many do—that the human soul is, of its nature, indestructible. At the same time I wish he had been a little clearer in his answer. I suppose what he believes is that "divine energy and support" will not be "withheld for a moment" from that part of "all created existence" on which he considers that, as clearly indicated by the Scriptures, immortality is confined and will be sustained, *i.e.*, on intelligent beings. I suppose, too, that by "intelligent beings," he means *all* intelligent beings; but I wonder does he include among them such intelligent beings as his own dog, and does he exclude such non-intelligent beings as human idiots from the number of those on whom immortality is conferred? On the whole I imagine that by "intelligent beings" he meant "all human beings," including the idiots and not including the dogs, etc.

However that may be, I would be glad if "J. B." would show us where and how "the Scriptures indicate clearly that immortality is conferred on (all) intelligent (human) beings, and will be sustained." For me, "I have been reading the Bible" for many years, not exactly "all my life, and can say with truth that no passage has ever suggested to me" that immortality is so widely and so universally conferred.

I have read there (Rom. ii. 7) of "them that by patient continuance in well-doing seek for . . . immortality," and that to them God will render "eternal life," which sounds very like "endless existence"; but I do not think St. Paul meant by them all mankind. I think his words rather point the other way. Certainly the context, which speaks (v. 12) of others "perishing" instead, looks straight the other way.

VINDEX.

April 17th, 1892.

P.S.—Allow me to mention that the parenthetical sentence in par. 5 of my last letter should read "(because they *would* not be cured)," not "(because they *could* not be cured)." No doubt my bad writing caused the mistake.

V.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Broughton, Rev. Walter Basil, M.A.; Vicar of Slad, Gloucestershire.

Cleary, Rev. R., M.A., Rector of Galbally; Rural Dean of Duntrylegue, Diocese of Emly.

D'Arcy, Rev. Charles Frederick, Incumbent of Billy, Coleraine; Chaplain to the Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore.

Davies, Rev. C. D. P., M.A.; Rector of East Marden, Sussex.

Davies, Rev. David B.A., late Curate of St. Paul's, Llanelly; Vicar of Llangennech, Carmarthenshire.

De Lom, Rev. Pierre B., Curate of St. James's, Fulham; Association Secretary of the Church Missionary Society for the Eastern District of Yorkshire.

Donne Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Great Yarmouth; Archdeacon of Huddersfield and Vicar of Wakefield.

Douglas, Rev. John Harvie, B.A.; Vicar of Abbotsbury, Dorset.

Drew, Rev. C. E., M.A.; Rector of Wymington, Beds.

Driver, Rev. G. F., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Radley, Berks; Rector of Cuxham-with-Easington, Oxfordshire.

'Espinasse, Rev. R. T., M.A.; Vicar of Burmington, Warwickshire.

Evans, Rev. Leonard Henry, M.A., late Vicar of Hope-under-Dinmore; Vicar of Rhayader, Radnorshire.

Faulconer, Rev. Robert Hoffman, Curate of St. Mary Magdalene's, Lincoln; Vicar of Swilland, Ipswich.

Franklin, Rev. Edwin Lewis, M.A.; Vicar of St. Mark's, Southampton.

Graves, Rev. Robert Vernon Ottley, M.A.; Rector of Shorewell, Isle of Wight.

Hall, Rev. E. Hutton, M.A.,Curate of St. George's, Sheffield; Vicar of Caverham-with-Horsehouse, near Bedale, Yorkshire.

Hallowes, Rev. Brabazon Chambre, M.A., Curate of Heath and Hault Hucknall, Derbyshire; Rector of Morcott, Rutland.

Hancock, Rev. Henry Charles; Chaplain of the Diocesan House of Mercy, Great Maplestead.

Hancock, Rev. William Edward, M.A., Vicar of Knaresborough, Yorkshire, and Rural Dean; Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.

Harding, Rev. Canon Jonathan, Incumbent of Gilford; Chaplaln to the Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore.

Hiles, Rev. Robert, M.A., Senior Curate of Whitechurch, Salop; Rector of Hordley, Ellesmere, Salop.

Hill, Rev. Arthur Du Boulay, M.A.; Secretary of the Salisbury Church Extension Society.

Hill, Rev. William J., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Flixton Parish Church; Vicar of Christ Church, Pendlebury, Manchester.

Holland, Rev. Alfred, M.A.; Rector of Huish, Devonshire.

Holmes, Rev. H. Forrester, Curate of Snitterfield; Vicar of Bampton, Devonshire.

Irwin, Rev. Charles Alfred Kemble; Rector of Swyncombe, Oxon.

Jackson, Rev. Corrie, M.A., Chaplain to the Foundling Hospital; Chaplain of the National Hospital for the Paralysed and Epileptic.

Johns, Rev. C. H. W., M.A.; Rector of St. Botolph's, Cambridge.

Jones, Rev. David, M.A., Vicar of Llandegai; Honorary Canon of Bangor Cathedral.

Jones, Rev. Hubert Francis, M.A.; Vicar of North Nibley, Gloucestershire.

Kendall, Rev. E. K., M.A.; Vicar of St. George's, Perry-hill, Kent.

Kissack, Rev. Edward William, B.A., Rector of Ballaugh; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.

Kitson, Rev. Benjamin Meredyth, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Lower Clapton; Rector of Barnes.

Langridge, Rev. Albert Henry; Perpetual Curate of St. Sampson, Cornwall.

Leveson, Rev. Charles A., Vicar of St. George's, Campden-hill; Vicar of Hemel Hempstead. Herts.

Miles, Rev. U. B., Vicar of Askham Richard, Yorks; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Yorkshire (Sir Andrew Fairbairn).

Morgan, Rev. John, Rector of Llandudno; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Carnarvonshire (Mr. J. Broome).

Morgan, Rev. John, Vicar of Glanogwen, Bangor; Honorary Canon of Bangor Cathedral.

Napier, Rev. C. W. A., B.A., Rector of Wiston; Prebendary of Bury in Chichester Cathedral.

Nash, Rev. Henry Havelock Ashley, M.A.; Licensed Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

O'Callaghan, Rev. Robert, B.A.; Vicar of Brandeston, Suffolk.

Oldham, Rev. Algernon Langston, M.A., Rector of St. Leonard's, Bridgnorth; Prebendary of East Withington in Hereford Cathedral.

Parker, Rev. M. B., Curate of Whickham; Vicar of Bishop Middleham, Durham.

Paton, Rev. J. D., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Southampton; Vicar of South Stoneham, Hants.

Peake, Rev. Frederic, M.A., LL.D., Incumbent of Nailsworth; Secretary of the Lord's-day Observance Society.

Peskett, Rev. Alfred, M.A.; Rector of St. Michael's, Long Stanton, Cambridge.

Petty, Rev. Harry Martin, B.A.; Chaplain at Plymouth Harbour.

Rees, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Conway; Honorary Canon and Precentor of Bangor Cathedral.

Robbins, Rev. John, D.D., M.A., Vicar of Hemel Hempstead; Vicar of St. George's, Campden-hill, Kensington.
Saulez, Rev. F. Wilberforce, Vicar of Okehampton, Devon; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Carmarthen.
Schneider, Rev. Gustavus Adolphus, M.A., Vice-Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.
Seaton, Rev. Douglas, M.A., Vicar of Goodrich; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Herefordshire (Mr. H. C. Moffatt).
Simpson, Rev. J. H., M.A., Rector of St. Mark's, Bexhill; Prebendary of Woodhorn in Chichester Cathedral.
Smallpiece, Rev. F. F., M.A.; Rector of Coveney, Ely.
Smith, Rev. A. W., Curate-in-Charge of St. Philip's, Nelson; Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's, Flixton, Manchester.
Soans, Rev. R. G., M.A., Senior Curate of All Saints', Bradford; Vicar of East Hardwick, near Pontefract.
Spooner, Rev. Charles Sherard Brocket, Curate of St. Peter and St. Paul, Upper Teddington; Vicar of St. Paul's, Shireshead, Garstang.
Stamer, Rev. Frederick Charles, M.A., Rector of Keele; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Staffordshire (Mr. Ralph Sneyd, of Keele Hall).
Stephenson, Rev. H. M., M.A.; Rector of Toft, and Vicar of Caldecote, Cambridge.
Stephenson, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Toxteth-park, Liverpool; Vicar of Boston, Lincolnshire.
Stukeley, Rev. E. C., M.A.; Diocesan Inspector for the Archdeaconry of Derbyshire.
Tamplin, Rev. G. F., M.A., Rector of Longton, Staffordshire; Vicar of St. Paul's, Sculcoates, Hull.
Thornton, Rev. F. F. M., Missioner diocese of Ely; Rector of Downham.
Thrupp, Rev. H. I. St. John, B.A., Curate of Seaton; Curate-in-Charge of the Mission Chapel of the Good Shepherd, St. Peter's, Plymouth.
Tidswell, Rev. S. W., M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Groombridge, Tunbridge Wells; Vicar of Tring, Herts.
Todd, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Curate of Christ Church, Doncaster; Vicar of Arksey, near Doncaster.
Twist, Rev. J. F., M.A., Curate of All Souls', Leeds; Precentor of St. Nicholas's, Chislehurst.
Urquhart, Rev. Edward William, M.A.; Licensed Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Walker, Rev. Charles Adolphus; Chaplain at Falmouth Harbour.
Watson, Rev. Charles Kaye, M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Guildford; Vicar of St. Paul's, Tranmere, Birkenhead.
Watson, Rev. James Bruce Scoular, M.A., Curate of Brompton, near Chatham; Chaplain to Her Majesty's Prison, Derby.
Watson, Rev. William, M.A.; Licensed Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Webb-Peploe, Rev. F. H., B.A.; Assistant-Chaplain to the Missions to Seamen for the Shipping on the Tyne.
Wellington, Rev. George; Vicar of Horton-cum-Woodlands, Dorset.
White, Rev. William Henry, M.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Williams, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Brecon; Perpetual Curate of St. Mary's, Brecon (by dispensation).
Williams, Rev. Stephen, late Vicar of Lamphey; Vicar of Llandegley, Radnorshire.
Wright, Rev. Canon Arthur, M.A., Rector of Coningsby; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lincolnshire.
Wylde, Rev. George; Rector of Poringland Magna, Norfolk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Crawford, Rev. William Andrew, M.A., Rector of Shalden, at Bournemouth, on the 11th inst.
Hannay, Rev. James, M.A., for forty-nine years Rector of Stockbridge, and Senior Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford, at Ashley Rectory, Stockbridge, on the 12th inst.
Hussey, Rev. C. J., M.A., at Denton Rectory, Kent, on the 11th inst., aged 59.
Keddle, Rev. Robert Antram, late Rector of Hooke, and Vicar of Toller Whelme, Dorset, at Henstridge, Somerset, on the 14th inst.
Vowler, Rev. Samuel Nicholson, at Wroxall, Isle of Wight, on the 7th inst., aged 66.
Weston, Rev. G. K., M.A., Rector of Merston, Chichester, at Merston, on the 11th inst., aged 68.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time my vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitated for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for more than an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses, Mr. Harness's Electropathic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restoring appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE GOSPEL OF PERSONAL SERVICE.

By the Rev. J. PERCIVAL, Head Master of Rugby.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford.

"He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. . . I am among you as he that serveth." — St. Luke xxii. 26, 27.

OF all the gifts or endowments which a young man can carry away with him from this University—so generous of higher gifts to those who will but take them at her hand—it is agreed that there is none to be compared with the right conception of life's calls and obligations.

But, notwithstanding this agreement, it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that the question is practically disregarded by the majority of those who come and go; although there is, in fact, no place where this consideration of a man's conception of the life before him, and the purpose that is to guide it, this thought of our practical ideal in life, claims more attention than here; for it is here, beyond any other place that could be named, excepting possibly in some cases the home or the school, that men pass through the laboratory of those critical influences that determine all their future. Very often this is not apparent to those who are actually passing through it. It is only in later years that we recognise the full significance of our life in Oxford, although I suppose there is hardly an undergraduate who, as he approaches the end of his undergraduate life, and looks back over his brief residence, does not already feel it in some degree.

If the early influences of home do more than anything else to root in the heart the natural pieties; if pure and tender affections that linger always in our consciousness, whatever our later life may be, are intertwined inseparably with the early memories of a mother's untiring love, or a father's care; if these memories bring back the echoes of voices that are already silent for some of you, and stir the heart with thoughts and feelings that never lose their power over us; or again, if your tastes and habits, and some, it may be, of your moral standards and views of life have been largely determined, for good or for evil, by the companionship and traditions of your school, according as your experiences there were good or bad; yet it is felt by the majority of men that the University is the home to which they owe those settled convictions of early manhood, or those views of life and conduct, those inspirations, or habits, or those examples that fix the abiding faith, and determine the quality of their late years, and their work in the world.

It is, therefore, not inappropriate for us to ask here this question—What is the conception of life which is gaining a footing in your thoughts, and to which your will is beginning to yield itself, and in obedience to which your affections and desires are found to be most commonly moving? "To whom ye yield yourself servants thus to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey."

Wherever we turn in the world we are met by two types of character abundantly illustrated; on the one hand that which may be designated as the type of practical materialism, on the other the type of Christian service. These represent the two forces that solicit every one of us.

As we see them working in individual lives, they are modified no doubt by a great variety of cross influences, so that whilst some men are obviously and almost wholly determined towards the one type or the other, in others there is unceasing variation, and even inconsistency, as if such lives were meant to show us what a strange medley of incongruous elements may dwell together in one soul. But amidst these varying phenomena there is always a tendency for one type or the other to get the upper hand and finally prevail in us. We may not feel at the moment how rapidly our fate is thus weaving itself. What we are specially conscious of is perhaps not the fateful tendency, but the doubtful battle of diverse elements with its uncertain issues, the battle of conviction against perverse habit, or of the sense of personal call against the fashion of our Society, the battle of the world's allurements against consecration to Christ.

It is possible that some of you thus looking into your own experience may find it a perfect chaos presenting different aspects hardly reconcilable, or speaking with two voices that do not harmonise. You seem to rise and to fall, or belong in some degree to two worlds, to be serving now one master and now again another.

This is not a very exceptional state, and it is the unceasing testimony that reminds us of the transitional or probational character of our present life; but out of it there is rising at every stage this imperative question: In what direction is it carrying us?

And my chief reason for asking your attention to what may seem so rudimentary a question is that the realities of practical life cause us to feel more and more deeply, as years advance, how these simple and primary questions dwarf all others in importance.

We see how some men suffer shipwreck of higher possibilities, or drift into the way of inevitable deteri-

oration, mainly because they did not settle it early in their minds what was to be the ruling conception of their life, because their practical aim and ideal, if any such was definitely framed in their thought, was only an intermittent sentiment, and not enthroned authoritatively over the springs of their active life.

On the other hand, we see how the early sacramental acceptance of a true purpose does undoubtedly help men to emerge from their moral and spiritual conflict victorious over the lower attractions of the world; for there is no question that men meet their temptations quite differently if at the outset of their free life they have deliberately set up before them, as written in the heavens, their conception of life and duty, which they acknowledge as supreme, and as claiming to be paramount, and carrying with it a Divine sanction. This, then, is the personal call that comes to us out of such considerations—to make our choice early between the two leading antagonistic conceptions of life that divide the world between them—materialistic self-seeking, or service in Christ.

We do not doubt the vast difference between the issues of any two lives according as they choose or yield to one or other of these.

If we look beyond present allurements to the natural and final outcome, it is always sufficiently plain before us and easy to be read.

Thus one man is solicited by the life of pleasure or indulgence, and he yields his will to the solicitation, whilst another plunges into the pursuit of gain, or the race for advancement or personal pre-eminence, and at the outset the differences between such lives may seem to be manifo'd; but however various they may be in other respects, there is always one common attribute that clings to them, and grows, and gathers strength, in both alike. Their life craves above all things for material satisfactions, and it is rooted in selfish aims, and the higher and more generous aspirations tend to become enfeebled in it.

This is their common condemnation before the tribunal of our moral judgment. No matter whether you choose the life of self-seeking competition—the thinly-veiled warfare which makes up the life of the majority, or the pleasure-seeking life which is always predaceous and destructive in its character, sacrificing others for the gratification of self; in either case the material issue of the life, if it is not modified by other influences, is that it dulls the spirit, and hardens the heart, and narrows the range of hope and sympathy, and deterioration is written over it as its final epitaph.

But the life of service in the will of God, service in the spirit of Christ, sets men from the first on a different plane, and alters all their outlook. The air and landscape of our life undergoes a complete change when our attitude, aims, ambitions, and relationships, are thus transformed, when, instead of the search for satisfactions, pleasures, power, the applause of men, or the mastery over externals, in some or other of the many forms in which they fascinate and enslave us, while we seem to be winning them, our will is kept free and independent of all these, and answers to the call of service as that which claims our unhesitating allegiance, and gives the fullest play to our best energies.

The egoism, or self-seeking, drops out of a life thus consecrated, and it is felt to be pervaded by a sense of sonship, or discipleship.

It is a life of upward look and reverence moving as in the presence of a spirit higher than our own, and as under a consecrating vow.

What more do we need than this familiar contrast to stamp deep in our thought and feeling the intrinsic difference between the materialistic life in any of its forms, with all its various slavery to sense or appetite, and the life in Christ, revealed for our inspiration in the Gospel, whose ideal is reverence, charity, labour, service, and sacrifice?

Well, then, which is to be your camp? That of materialistic individualism, or that of service for the love of the brethren?

So long as life and thought run undisturbed in traditional or conventional grooves, men fall naturally into the groove that is most familiar, and run their course without much question; but this is hardly possible for you. The influences of your generation are such as do not favour this easy conformity. You have been born to a time of ferment and radical change, a time in which many conventional and traditional beliefs and ideas have begun to lose their traditional force—a time of new research and new knowledge, new influences, new movements; and such a time being pregnant with consequences which are only dimly seen or felt as yet, summons men very imperatively to look well to the ideals to which they surrender their life.

But if the time makes this unusual demand upon those who are just beginning their life in it, it is charged with stimulus, and does not leave you without warning and guidance.

Compared with the men of fifty years ago, those of you who have grown up under the influences that are most active just now—whether political, literary, or scientific—are living in a new world. The air you breathe is charged with new elements. The investigations and discoveries of science have so changed men's modes of thought that they look on the world and its life with new eyes. Even theology has changed her note, and men read their Bible with a new conciousness about it. Its words suggest new inquiries, and the problems from which the human mind can never escape assume new forms and a new mystery.

And when we step from these inner chambers of life we are met by an unexampled diffusion of wealth and luxury, and all things that charm and stimulate the senses, and bind us to the outer world.

But happily this great wave of scientific and material development does not comprise the whole change. It has brought with it another wave of new freedom and popular enlightenment, and thus it has come to pass that the very influences which have given an unparalleled impulse towards materialism in thought and luxury in life, laying heavily on men's minds the burden of the external world, and thrusting the unseen, the ideal, the spiritual, into the dim background, have at the same time brought with them the germs of reaction and fresh change.

That progress of all material life by leaps and bounds which has distinguished our century, has only brought it home to us after a brief experience more vividly than ever before, that no external prosperity can satisfy the soul's aspirations, or regenerate the life of men.

The epoch of industrial peace under the ægis of unimpeded individual freedom, which was to cure society of its inveterate ills, has only served to emphasize some of them, and has proved a disappointment and a failure, so far as men's highest hopes were concerned, while it has roused in the multitudinous poor gathered in great cities and growing more intelligent, new cravings and a new ferment, the issues of which are yet to be seen. And the practical result is that you of the younger generation find yourselves in the presence of some ominous phenomena and of unusually stirring calls.

The presence of these phenomena, and this consciousness that you are looking towards an epoch pregnant with revolutionary forces, lifts the question you have to settle with yourselves about your conception of life out of the region of the commonplace.

If it be true, as some men say, that the time is approaching when the egoistic materialism which has culminated in our recent progress and prosperity, with its glaring contrasts of wealth and poverty, must render up its account at the bar of that thought which determines the future; and if the verdict goes against it, and this recent half-century, with all its splendid promise, has indeed proved a moral and spiritual failure, it will rest with such as you to inspire the future to higher aims, and to lead it towards happier issues.

Let us hear, then, for a moment what impression our time is leaving on those who have studied it with every desire to estimate it fairly. "When we reflect," says a recent writer of this class, "what is the actual state of society, at this its latest hour of development, with its egoism intensified by the ethics of the market and of industry; when we consider the general moral tone of society, its real working code of morality as distinct from the ethics of the schools, its low theory of life, its false valuation of the things that are good or evil, its lost ideal of heroism, its relaxed standard of honour and duty; and, above all, when we reflect that religious belief—the last reserve force to strengthen and support morality, which, without it, yields so easily to the pressure of self-interest—that this also is breaking down—we cannot pretend to be without serious apprehensions about the time that is before us." "We need," says the same writer, and he is no orthodox Conservative, whose language might possibly be suspected of some exaggeration, "we need both a moral and a religious awakening—we need a new conception of the meaning, and the duties, and the possibilities of our life."

Such are the voices we hear around us. And if this condemnation of the underlying spirit of the time, this pervading spirit of practical materialism, should seem to any of us to be overcharged, we may at least observe that it is echoed by those great instinctive movements of reaction from it which are so significant just now—on the one hand the uprising of socialistic discontent, on the other the new inspiration to the service of man which is taking fresh hold on the Christian world.

Here, in Oxford, you hardly need to be reminded of the growth of this sentiment of Christian service, and the breaking up of what we might fairly call the mistaken individualism of traditional religion. "He that is greatest among you"—such was the injunction of the Saviour at the crisis of His earthly life, and when His own ministry was over—"let him be as the younger, and he that is chief as he that doth serve." Nothing could have been plainer than such emphatic words, and yet it must be admitted that in past times this duty of service has been singularly overlooked. Although it is the fundamental characteristic of practical Christianity, and is, in fact, the embodiment of the Saviour's sacrifice in the common life, it has hardly been taken into account as a part of an ordinary man's conception of his life; and there is nothing among the movements of the present moment which is at once more significant as a condemnation of the conventional life of the past, or more pregnant with hope and promise for the future, than the uprising of a new conscience in this respect. It is in the presence of this stirring of the waters that you have to make your choice. You are part of a society in which it is beginning to be felt more than in past times, felt more deeply and more widely, and with a new sense of personal duty, that Christ is demanding of all those who call themselves His followers a life which shall exhibit this spirit of service.

And the question is pressed home upon us with a new earnestness and persistency, What part are you taking or preparing to take in this gospel of personal service?

If you accept the principle of this call to the service of men in Christ; if you take it into your soul not merely as a prevalent sentiment, but as the consecrating and ruling power in it, you are baptised into the spirit of a new discipleship. In the light of that spirit some things that trouble you

will become clearer. You will find in it the well-spring of faith and hope; whilst it will go with you as a safeguard against sinful allurements and low views of life; and it will live in you as a new force.

And it may be that the presence or absence of this spirit of Christian service in you, and in the generation after you, may help to determine the very framework of society in the coming century.

As we note the rising voice of socialistic cravings in almost every country of Europe, as it rises more and more ominously in our own city populations with every returning wave of privation or distress, we feel that these calls to give ourselves to the service of men in the spirit of Christ come with very imperative and pressing claims.

It is clearly not a time for the young to turn their backs upon them. The civilised world is felt to be entering on a democratic age; and this, whatever dangers may be involved in it, is of good omen for Christianity, for the Spirit of Christ is the true embodiment of democratic life. But we are warned that the democracy of the future will be socialistic in its principles. Is it then to be Christian or anti-Christian, religious or irreligious? It would seem as if there is held out to us a choice which may be critical for the time to come.

If the mass of ordinary men who call themselves Christians go in their way of egoistic self-seeking, pre-occupied, as hitherto, with their pleasure or their profit, we are threatened with a rising flood of irreligious or anti-religious socialism, which, although, as we believe, its hopes are built upon the sand, and will prove utterly delusive, is yet a mighty force for destruction, if once let loose. Finally, then, what is your conception of the part that you are called to take in the drama of your coming years?

We pray that you may foster in your hearts, and give full force in your active life, to that spirit of service in Christ Jesus, which stands revealed to us in His Sermon on the Mount, which was embodied in His own Divine life, and consecrated on the Cross of His Sacrifice.

THE ARGUMENT FROM DESIGN.

By the Rev. JOHN LIGHTFOOT, D.Sc., M.A., Vicar of Cross Stone, Todmorden.

Paper read at the Meeting of the Todmorden and District Clerical Society.

THERE are few arguments for the existence of God which appeal more readily to the popular mind than that drawn from the open page of nature. There appears such an amount of wonderful adaptation and design in every object, organic and inorganic, that we may examine, that it would appear the soundest as well as the most obvious conclusion that in these things we have an irrefragable proof of the existence and workmanship of the Almighty.

It is, therefore, a matter of no small perplexity when we find a very large number of men amongst those best qualified to speak of nature and its wonderful details, assuring us that all they see neither suggests nor warrants any such inference as that which seemed to us so obvious. Nay, they seem to say, that so far from the conclusion being warranted that nature points to the existence and design of a personal God, the great bulk of facts appear to them to point in an exactly opposite direction.

Now, as to the "facts" in question there can be no argument whatever. A fact is a fact, and there is an end of the matter. The theologian and the philosopher must accept "facts" as science finds them for him; but as to the inference which the given material shall justify, here there is evidently room for wide divergence of opinion. Men, transparently honest in their intention, and equally gifted with the critical faculty, do, it seems, draw most opposite conclusions from the same set of facts. On the one hand there is the confident assertion that herein we have evidence of intelligent design in nature; on the other these wonderful instances of adaptation are considered only as particular instances of the universal law of physical causation, which neither requires nor justifies the supposition of a personal God.

It is a matter of deep concern that the reason of this contradiction in the realm of inference be properly stated and understood. This paper is offered as a small contribution in that direction.

About the "facts" there can be no room for doubt. In the region of the inorganic, the whole phenomena of crystalization, the unvarying ratio of the combination of chemical elements and other such instances come at once into mind. It is in the region of the organic, however, that the facts are most abundant and significant. Every organ possessed by each individual contributes its quota to the perfection of the whole organism. The structure of every animal is beautifully adapted to the conditions in which the animal lives. The whole phenomena of instinct in the lower animals is so wonderful, that the student is lost in admiration. After the most cursory glance at these facts—and deeper study only tends in this respect to make them appear more wonderful—any one may well be excused asking, "Whence comes this wonderful adaptation? Whence comes this marvellous ingenuity shown by unintelligent creatures? Surely they speak to us of an Intelligence which has designed them, of a Beneficence which has conferred them?" The Duke of Argyle tells us that during a conversation with Mr. Darwin on the wonderful contrivances in nature, he asked the great scientist whether it was not impossible to look at these without seeing that they were the effect and the expression of mind. Mr. Darwin's

reply was, "Well, it often comes over me with overpowering force, but at other times it seems to go."

But why? For this is just the core of our difficulty. I suppose the answer would be twofold. First it would be said that the facts which are usually quoted to establish the inference of an intelligence that has designed the various adaptations and contrivances in nature are, after all, only a portion of the facts; and that there is another set of facts, equally significant, which point to an opposite conclusion. Then, secondly, it would be said that even though there is a large amount of plausibility in the conclusion that nature affords evidence of intelligent design, yet there is another way of interpreting nature which makes intelligent design an unnecessary assumption. It is acknowledged that this latter interpretation has less of plausibility than the other, but just as in the region of textual criticism men have learnt the wisdom of usually preferring the more difficult reading, so in deciphering the open book of nature the same rule may perhaps apply. This twofold reply needs careful scrutiny.

(1.) It must be freely conceded that the fair order of nature is only acquired by wholesale waste and sacrifice. Some of this may serve an ascertainable purpose; but what of all the waste, the misery and death that accompanies the struggle which determines the permanent order, the maladjustments which perish in conflict with the adjustments? It would be all very well if in the world there were nothing but successful forms of life; but how can the theory of a designing intelligence be held in view of the vast array of existences which seem to be created only to fail? Then, too, the aimless destruction of life in the lower world has its sad counterpart in the realm of man, where bad actions, false thoughts, and ugly imaginations perish in the conflict with beauty and truth. The difficulty, it is said, is further increased by the fact that it would seem impossible to hold a theory of a supreme designer without coupling therewith the idea of beneficence. There is a deep philosophic reason for this upon which, however, I cannot speak now. Now if this be so, how can it be asserted that this highest beneficent intelligence deliberately [by design] created suffering, cruelty, and set pitfalls in the way of the unwary? It may very well be that the magnitude of the difficulty may be somewhat lessened by arguments such as those skilfully used by Mr. Illingworth in his essay on the "Problem of Pain"; but the larger amount of waste and suffering is not touched thereby, and men in their perplexity feel driven to hold the Almighty responsible for the evil as well as the good. Before considering what answer is possible to this perplexity, it will be more convenient to get into view the second aspect of difficulty to which reference has been made.

(2.) What has thus far been stated by way of objection to the theory of an Intelligent Designer has been grounded upon a certain class of facts which had apparently been overlooked. The second aspect of objection has reference to the inference that any or all the facts of nature seem to warrant. It is suggested that the existence of design in nature is an entirely unnecessary assumption. No doubt if Deity wished to construct a world of existences with forms and structures such as we see all around us in nature, we can only imagine it as being done in accordance with a preconceived plan or design. But closer inspection of nature seems to point to the conclusion that those very facts which at first give rise to the surmise of an original intelligent design are, after all, only the result of a process which is not design. This process is what is termed "Natural Selection." It is not pretended that this theory is yet removed beyond the sphere of hypothesis. It is, however, found to be a safe working hypothesis, and it contains no larger element of the doubtful in it than the older theory which presupposed an Intelligent Designer. Indeed this older theory is, to the student of nature, always hampered by the fact that men must therein believe the waste, the destruction, the evil, to which reference has been made, serve some purpose, but a purpose which, under the theory, we are always unable to verify.

That the beautiful adaptations of life, in its individual forms, are the result of natural selection will scarcely be disputed. Indeed the very meaning of the process, so called, is that structures not so adapted do not survive. If it be said that apparently useless organs do survive, the answer is that nature does not work by leaps and bounds —the disappearance of useless organs is gradual enough, but they are in the process of disappearing. Now, in speaking of natural selection, men, as a rule, and clergymen nearly always, put the "cart before the horse." A structure is not adapted because it excludes rivals from competition, but because it is a structure of a definite kind. Of the many varying varieties which are indifferently produced, only those are left in existence which can live under the conditions to which they are exposed. Thus adaptation and existence are simply convertible terms. We say a given type is adapted only after, and in consequence of, its its successes; in short, the "adaptation" is only something read into the successful form by the contemplating mind. This is what observation teaches. But this is the very reverse of the common theory of an intelligence which designed all the exquisite forms with which nature abounds.

Now from these and similar general arguments it is inferred that when science has yielded her proximate interpretation of nature, then all has been said that can be or needs be said on the subject. Any further teleological or ultimate interpretation of nature is ruled, somewhat impatiently, "out of court." But this is just where the scientific mind is liable to error. Dogmatism is always open to

suspicion, and scientific dogmatism not less so than theological dogmatism. It may very well be that well-nigh, possibly even all, the entire range of observable phenomena has been brought under the category of physical causation. We have seen the old theories of systems of causation other than physical die out in a very instructive manner. Thus Astrology has given place to Astronomy, Animism to Physics, Exorcism to Medicine, and it somehow does not give us any particular shiver to contemplate the supplanting of the old notion of a special creation, or creations, by a theory of natural evolution. But in all this we see only an attack upon a particular form of the design argument; and it may very safely be argued that there is all the difference in the world between the assertion that there is design in nature, and the more restricted question of the mode in which this design has operated.

Again, with reference to the apparently abortive designs in nature, the apparently aimless destruction of life in the lower world, the failure of the less fit in their struggle for existence with the more fit, in all this there does not seem real ground for objection to design in nature. For all the highly complex causes which are summarised under the general term "natural selection" are, in reality, only particular instances of the general law of physical causation. It is the worsest error of logic to seize upon this or that particular case which may probably afford evidence against the hypothesis of design, and therefrom to argue that the method of physical causation on the large scale is incompatible with the hypothesis of design. The argument against design founded upon any particular case of natural causation—and the whole process, called "natural selection," is such particular case—can only be valid when accompanied by the previous supposition, that natural causation is everywhere else, or in its very nature, inimical to the theory of design. If, however, natural causation is really the Divine method and the expression of the Divine purpose, then the innumerable instances of what, for the present, we call failures, become an obvious necessity. That is to say they are a necessity, unless we introduce the perfectly gratuitous assertion that it would have been more consistent with the Divine beneficence if a miraculous interposition had been made in their favour, whereby the elsewhere uniform sway of natural causation should have been suspended. This, however, is a gratuitous assertion. For, besides the obvious impropriety of so placing ourselves at the Divine point of view, it should be remembered that such an argument, after all, is based upon the further unproved assumption that cases of failure are not merely relative but absolute failures, not merely failures in relation to the beings that perish, but also in relation to the final ends to which the whole system of natural causation, as the purpose of God, may be tending. The case stands thus: By the working of a natural law, which for the moment we assume to be the realisation of the Divine purpose, an infinitely large number of varieties are produced. Those which are not adapted to the surroundings in which they are produced are slowly, but surely, extinguished. How are they failures? They can only be so called on the assumption that to maintain their individual existence is the sole end of their being. If the "fair order of nature," in increasing perfection is the end, then the failures in dying out have in reality contributed thereto. In this view it is not correct to speak of them as either wasted or sacrificed. In short, if a man hold that the "fair order of nature," and that "fairer" order towards which things are surely moving, be the purpose of the Divine Intelligence, and if along with this he hold that this result has been achieved by the general system of natural causation, and that natural causation is the Divine method, then it seems to me that no argument in the scientific interest can be advanced inimical to such a theory of design in nature, still less any drawn from the fact that such causation entails the continual elimination of the less efficient types.

This very general conclusion, however, would not be considered sufficient for ordinary practical work by those who have to minister in spiritual things. For there is a danger that such a very general theory would seem to eat out all life from prayer, and destroy much that is fairest in the inner spiritual experience of the believing soul. This very natural fear, I think, could be shown to have no rational foundation. But, although for ordinary purposes it is quite justifiable to use highly pictorial metaphors, yet, in view of the critical attitude of modern science, the actual meaning of our terms needs carefully to be kept in view. Few men have ever given themselves to think out what the word "Creation" should mean. Even the least philosophic mind would shrink from the notion of the Almighty working after the manner of a stone-mason, building up the everlasting hills. Equally so do we shrink from the thought of Deity using the universe as a workshop in which to experiment, and, only after many fruitless trials, producing the fair design. We shrink from this. Whatever else we mean, that at least is not our meaning. And yet it is only against such a conception of God that modern science has provided an efficient weapon. And here it seems possible to point the moral of this paper.

Our formal predicates of Deity are necessarily vague and highly speculative. But bound in the trammels of these, men are often driven into false positions. In the region of speculative theology our positions may want re-thinking. The deeper reading of nature affords no argument against design. It may be also true that nature in itself gives no demonstration of the Divine. Nor will this latter statement trouble us. The existence of

God is the first article of our belief, not of our knowledge. It is in the sacred sphere of man's own personal experience that the belief in God finds its warrant and justification. When, however, this presupposition is established, then no doubt nature affords innumerable confirmations thereof. If, however, it seem a matter of reproach that the ultimate basis of the religious idea is faith, it may safely be remembered that the "unjust," no less than the "just," walk by faith. The presuppositions of science are as great and as undemonstrable as those of religion. In both cases their validity is justified by their practical consequences.

Meanwhile there is a new conception of the relation of Deity to the world which lies less open to the criticism of science than the ordinary one. What is here called the ordinary conception is that of two absolutely distinct entities: God and His world, with a mere mechanical relation between the two. This is only a particular case of the separation of subject and object to the confusion of all rational procedure. A wiser philosophy has taught men to see that such ideal separation is fallacious, that the one presupposes the other in the unity of thought as much as the concave the convex. For this idea of mechanical relation between absolutely separate entities some have substituted the idea of organic relation. This latter idea, fruitful in its consequences, does not seem to be subject to the same strain as the older idea inevitably must be. In this view the Divine subject is the richer for the increasing wealth of the inseparable object, and design thus takes a newer and deeper meaning. That the New Testament lends itself to this view is a point strongly insisted upon. Whether, however, our present formal teaching as to the Divine attributes, as contained in the Articles, allows this view to be read into them by clergymen of the Church of England, I leave others to say.

THE Rev. James E. Griffin, for the last ten years curate of St. Matthew's, Sheffield, has accepted missionary work in Central Africa in connection with the Universities' Mission.

CANON THOMPSON PHILLIPS, vicar of Ivegill, has been appointed honorary secretary of the Carlisle Diocesan Clergy Aid Society and the "Harvey Goodwin Rest Fund."

THE Bishop of Carlisle has appointed the Rev. Dr. Lumby, Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, the Rev. J. W. Diggle, Honorary Canon of Liverpool, and the Rev. H. T. E. Barlow, Principal of Bishop Wilson Theological School, Isle of Man, as his examining chaplains; and Canon Richmond, vicar of St. Mary's, Carlisle, the Rev. Richard Bower, vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Carlisle, and the Rev. H. E. Campbell, vicar of St. George's, Millom, as his chaplains. Mr. Bowman, of Carlisle, and Sir John Hassard, of Doctors' Commons, have been appointed legal secretaries.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 30, 1892.

UNPRACTISED PRINCIPLES.

THE Women's Suffrage Bill has come on—and off—in a fairly large assembly of the House of Commons; it has been rejected by the narrow majority of *twenty-three* votes. This is one of those defeats which are victories, for it is perfectly certain that a cause which has only a majority of twenty-odd votes against it, and those given on purely party considerations, and that not the best party either, is sure to triumph in the end, and the end cannot be far distant.

The time is gone by for treating this matter of female suffrage as a question of sex. When we find all political parties inviting and even imploring women to further their political ends, it is absurd to contend that they are unfitted for political life. There is hardly a member of the House of Commons who recorded his vote last night against Sir Albert Rollit's Bill, who was not helped into his seat by the women whose aid he so insolently disclaimed. It will serve him right if he finds it difficult to replace the ladder which he has contemptuously kicked down.

Without imputing any motives to the hon. members who valiantly struck women last night, and their brothers-in-arms who courageously absented themselves from the conflict, it is hard to see how they can pretend themselves to be either conscientious or consistent. "Dear Mr. Samuel Smith" on the one hand openly avows his anxiety lest women should become politically too strong for men. He is a latter-day Pharaoh, who means to keep his Israelites in subjection lest they grow "too hard" for him. Mr. Gladstone, on the other hand, is chiefly concerned to save and defend women from the turmoil of political strife from which the poor things shrink.

Either one of these "dear" men may be right, but it is perfectly impossible for both to be. And yet they are joining hands over the matter, and pretending not to see that one argument entirely destroys the other. We say *pretending*, for both these men are trained and experienced logicians, and it would be nothing short of an insult to suppose them incapable of detecting logical fallacies.

The action of the Liberal party in thus opposing and frustrating what one would have supposed to be an essentially Liberal measure cannot have any abiding result. But it will not do for the advocates of Women's Suffrage to rest content with a moral victory. The average Member of Parliament appears to learn nothing and to forget nothing, and he has evidently not yet grasped the fact that political influence can be wielded to some extent without a vote, though he is quite willing to admit it when it serves his purpose. It is difficult to conceive that so many members of the Liberal party have not comprehended the value to their cause of the various political federations of women. It remains to teach this to these gentlemen. Heaven helps those who help themselves. And women will not get the vote unless they help themselves to it. The history of the extension of the Franchise has repeated itself any time these last sixty years, and no section of the community has ever got the vote unless they proved to some important political party that it was worth while giving it to them and dangerous to withhold it. Women ought to take warning by this. They cannot exert direct influence at the polls, but they have a good deal to say before the polling. And every association of women in town or country formed for a political purpose should definitely decline to support any candidate who will not pledge himself to vote in favour of any Bill which may be brought into Parliament extending the franchise to women. Members of Parliament, confident in the unselfishness of their women-allies, have at present no fear of this, and that is the reason why they are politically untrue to women. It is the same sort of confidence which stimulates the drunken wife-beater to fresh onslaughts. He is perfectly certain that the woman will never betray him. When women give both M.P.'s and wife-beaters sufficient grounds for believing that their pleasant pastime is not to be followed with impunity, and that women after they have been insulted, outraged, or degraded cannot be whistled or frightened back into brainless obedience and hard work and idiotic devotion, they will change their tactics—but not till then.

THE Bishop of Caledonia (Dr. Ridley) is on his way to England shortly. In the early part of the year he had a serious illness, and he has now been ordered by his medical advisers to take a prolonged rest.—*Times.*

THE BOOK OF ARMAGH.

BY THE LATE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM REEVES, D.D., LL.D., M.B., PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY, HON. MEM. SOC. ANTIQ., SCOT. AND ZURICH, BISHOP OF DOWN, CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

(*Continued from page* 202.)

THIS enlightened disposition of literary property speedily resulted in good, for the Rev. Charles Graves, with a scholar's head and a critic's eye, commenced such an examination of the volume as it had never before undergone, and in an able paper communicated the result to the Academy, in the November of the same year.

Subsequently the ownership of the precious volume passed, on the death of the Rev. Francis Brownlow, to his son William Brownlow, of Knapton, Esq., and by him was allowed to continue in its place of public deposit. Together with the most precious articles of the Academy Museum, it was removed to the Irish Exhibition of 1853, from whence it passed, on the 4th of November, into the possession of the Rev. Dr. Reeves, who purchased it from Mr. Brownlow, for the sum of £300. It remained in the hands of its new possessor till 1858, when it was surrendered to the Library of Trinity College, as the gift of his Grace the Lord Primate, who, when informed that the owner would dispose of it for the sum he paid, in order to its being placed there, had, with princely readiness as well as liberality, remitted the desired amount, and thus secured for this invaluable monument of the sacred literature of Ireland a resting-place in the depository, of all others, best suited to be its last home.

Of the two accompaniments of the manuscrip which are mentioned in the letter to Edward Lhuyd only one remains, namely, the leather case; the other the Papal Bull, has since disappeared. It certainly came into the possession of the Brownlow family; and knowing this, Dr. Reeves made inquiry of Lord Lurgan's agent, whether it might not, as a parchment record folded like a deed, still exist among the family muniments at Lurgan, from which place the book itself departed only forty-six years ago. The result, however, of a search which was obligingly made, was the assurance that such a document was not in existence there. What may have been its contents, it is impossible now to pronounce. Transmitted through six successions of the Brownlow family, as the manuscript was, and in later times liberally lent to the curious, and on one occasion all but lost, it is very likely that the loose document was either disregarded as unimportant, or forgotten during the literary travels of its principal.

The Case, however, is safely preserved, and as there are only two such articles in existence, it may be well to give a brief description of it. It is formed of a single piece of leather, 36 inches long, and 12½ broad, folded at right angles in such a manner as to become, (two of the edges being closed with thong stitches,) a flat-sided pouch, 12 inches high, 12¾ inches broad and 2¼ inches deep. Part of it is doubled upon itself, so as to make a flap, in which are eight brass-bound slits, for the admission of as many brass loops,

which stand out from the substance of the case, in which traversed two metal rods, having cross-guards on the outside extremities, like the rod of a valise, and which, meeting in the middle, were secured to a brass lock by a staple which passed through them. The surface of the leather externally is black and polished like ebony, by age, and is ornamented all over, in low relief, with curious patterns of grotesque animals, modifications of circles, and the interlacing peculiar to ancient Irish art. These seem to have been communicated to the leather by pressure upon blocks, in which the patterns were sunk, to which the new and pliant surface of the leather accommodated itself, under the influence of pressure and damp, and being allowed to harden in this position, retained the artistic unevenness of surface which it had assumed. On examining the inside, it is found that a depression in the under always corresponds to an elevation on the upper surface. Of course, the whole face of the leather was blocked in pattern before it was folded over, to present front, back, sides, bottom, and flap at top. It does not appear likely that the pouch was made expressly for the manuscript it now accompanies, but rather to have been one of many formed from the same moulds, inasmuch as its dimensions, in length and breadth, greatly exceed those of the book, while its depth is less than the thickness of the volume, even in its present state; so much so, that the portion which is occupied wears an appearance of undue distension. How much more would this disproportion exist if the manuscript were enclosed in a massive silver case, of which the leather pouch was to be the external covering. Attached to the upper corners are the ends of a strap, which enabled it to be slung from the shoulders, or suspended from a wall-pin, after the manner of a modern post-bag. We know, from record, that it was customary with the Irish, in early times, to carry about their religious books, whether scriptural or liturgical, in leathern satchels, and by the same provision to dispose of them in the library. Book-shelves seem to have been unknown in the primitive economy of Irish monasteries, and all the volumes were suspended in satchels, by straps, from pins or hooks in the wall. This plan is still adopted in some Eastern monasteries, and the Hon. Robert Curzon's travels in the Levant furnish us with a drawing and explanation quite in point, where he describes the library of the ancient convent of Souriani, in Egypt, on the west side of the Nile. It is also by a knowledge of this practice of the Irish, that we are enabled, while we reject the fable, to appreciate the allusion in the old legend of St. Longaradh, the Learned, of Offerlane, which states that, "on the night of Longaradh's death, all the book-satchels of Ireland fell down." And again, "Columkille, and all those who were with him, wondered and were silent when they heard the shaking of the books." Thus, also, we can understand how conveniently these objects of veneration and care could be disposed of in one of the stories of a round tower, whenever, by reason of a sudden emergency, it might be judged desirable to employ this building in its secondary use of refuge and defence.

The leather case accompanied the manuscript when it was presented to the Library of Trinity College, and it is to be hoped that, when the changes of that building, now in progress, are completed, a becoming receptacle for this inestimable book, and its venerable cover, will be provided, worthy of their own character, and of the donor's munificence.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

UNWISE RESTRICTIONS FOR THE CLERGY.

SIR,—I see that the Archbishop of York has refused to sanction the appointment of a clergyman to an English parish, on the ground that he has been ordained by an American bishop; and in your leading article of the 16th of the present month, you say that "the question is never likely to be of much importance." I have to say in reply to this, that all experience shows we never know how much harm has been done, and how much good has been hindered by any restriction, until after it has been removed. But this is not the whole, nor the most important part of the question. So long as American and Colonially-ordained clergymen are ineligible to positions in the Church of England, it is impossible to believe that the Church of England, so far as its mind is expressed in its own laws, believes in its own Apostolic mission. A really Apostolic Church, worthy of its position and its privileges, could not put such a stigma of inferiority on a ministry ordained by bishops who derive their consecration from itself as the mother Church. This half excommunication of the Colonial Churches—the daughter churches of the Church of England—dates from the darkest period of the eighteenth century, when the English bishops, while giving what was I believe a tardy and reluctant consent to the consecration of an Episcopate for the Colonies which are now the United States, inserted in the necessary Act of Parliament a clause, disqualifying Colonially-ordained clergymen for English appointments.

The Episcopal Church of Scotland is under the same disqualification, but for this there may perhaps be reasons of which I am ignorant. I am thankful to say that the communion of the Church of Ireland with that of England is hindered by no restrictions whatever.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, April 20th, 1892.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION.

SIR,—I thought that what I said in my last letter would have drawn forth a more explicit reply from "Vindex." His first communication was headed, "Eternal Destruction *versus* Aionial Purgatory and Endless Torment." Thereupon I arrived at the conclusion that he must hold the doctrine of annihilation, if he rejects the only other interpretations of the texts, rendered in our versions, "eternal or everlasting destruction," and "destruction of both body and soul in hell," with which I am acquainted. Strange to say he continues to find fault with me, but abstains from telling us in what sense he understands those passages.

He says he believes in the "Complete Triumph of Moral Good over Evil" as firmly as I do. But I infer that his conception must be very different from mine, because, to my mind, that grand and cheering belief is vitally connected with the question between us, whereas he expresses a contrary opinion. I hold that there can be no complete triumph of moral

good, until all intellects and all hearts are brought under the sway of light and love. Such glorious hopes and expectations necessarily imply the training of intelligent beings, who all come into existence without knowledge and with undeveloped faculties. I think every individual of Adam's race, except those who die very young, is *exposed* to "raging passions, vices, and crimes," and that almost every intelligent Christian, gifted with sensibilities, must feel a consciousness at times that he might have been a murderer, or might have become guilty of disgraceful vices, if the providential goodness of God had not interposed restraining circumstances. The language we find in Rom. vii. seems to indicate feelings of that nature, as well as the recorded utterances of many pious men.

Under the classification of intelligent beings, I do not include what is called the brute creation, but I include all the race of Adam without exception. I have a strong conviction that every child of Adam possesses a spiritual nature, in which is implanted a germ of the Divine likeness, never entirely destroyed and which will finally be developed in all. As far as my very imperfect discernment guides me, the movements of the spiritual essence in this life can only be made through the cerebral and nervous organisation, the sudden or gradual derangements or defects in which have startling effects on human character. Sin mars the physical as well as the intellectual and moral qualities, and the transgressions of parents are visited on their descendants through the trans mission of noxious hereditary tendencies, introducing disease and defect into the brain and other organs. I suppose that solemn awe-inspiring principle of discipline will become apparent to men and women with increased clearness, and that preachers will condescend to look into such things, and appeal to family affection as a restraining influence on thoughtless and evil conduct.

The marvellous processes of the all-comprehending educational system we may perceive by the efforts of reason, and which, I think are impressively touched upon in the Book of Revelation, will, I conjecture, occupy ages far beyond our calculation, embracing the present and future life. It seems to me that a belief in the complete triumph of moral good, not partial but all-subduing, throws an immense flood of light over the perplexities of these sublime topics. Otherwise, the most gloomy ideas take possession of men's minds. To my own self, with much confidence and admiring gratitude, the Bible seems to open the most cheering prospects of immortality and deliverance from evil, for all beings gifted with a spiritual nature, whether on our earth, or throughout the illimitable extent of intelligent life, which the researches of science enable us to imagine.

J B.

Canonbury, April 25th, 1892.

KANAKA LABOUR IN QUEENSLAND.

SIR,—Now that so influential a *Guardian* correspondent as Bishop Barry joins with the Rev. I. G. Paton in stigmatising Kanaka labour in Queensland as "practically an inhuman traffic—almost a slave-trade" (Mr. Paton does without the "almost"), it is really time that North Queenslanders should rise and protest against the employment of such language by responsible persons. In various quarters during the last few years, I have met with allusions of this kind, but now that a bishop and the *Guardian* unite in casting this cruel calumny upon us, I cannot refrain from doing my best to remove the unmerited stigma. And I trust, Sir, that you will find room for this letter in your next issue.

I have been living for some few years in London, but Mackay, North Queensland, the centre of the sugar-growing districts, is my home. I settled there early in the "sixties," and have had personal acquaintance with the South Sea Island labour importation from the beginning of the sugar industry. I have known the planter employers, the Government agents who superintended the recruiting of the islanders, the captains of the vessels, the plantation overseers, and the islanders themselves, and may say that I have a full and exact knowledge of all the circumstances of Mr. Paton's "slave-trade." Really, Sir, I can hardly keep cool when I hear the employment of Kanakas called "an inhuman traffic." Speaking from my experience, particularised above, I proclaim in the most earnest and distinct terms that nothing could be further from the truth. I protest vehemently against the minds of English people being poisoned by sensationally-worded attacks, unsupported by an atom of evidence.

Bishop Barry's references to the Kanaka labour trade appear in a letter about the New Guinea Mission, of which the late Rev. A. A. Maclaren was the leader. He is, perhaps, not aware that Mr. Maclaren was the Church of England clergyman in Mackay for some years, and took a deep interest in the welfare of the islanders, who used to attend his church in large numbers. He visited them on the plantations, and was thoroughly satisfied that their condition was good. I knew Mr. Maclaren well, and he has often stayed at my house. I recollect him saying to me once, "These boys are happier here than they would be in their own islands; and they are more amenable to the influence of religious instruction on account of the civilising process to which they have been exposed."

The islanders were engaged for three years, at the end of which term their wages (£18) were given to them; and they were clothed and fed by their employers. I can show you photographs of the natives taken on their arrival and at the end of their engagement, so that you may judge if "inhumanity" was their fate when on North Queensland plantations. They were taken back to their islands—if they wished to go—when their three years were up, and a month afterwards the same men were *always* eager to re-engage when a schooner came along. I knew one boy who re-engaged four times. And, Sir, it is apparent to every globe-trotter who visits the sugar plantations that the Kanakas are well fed, jolly and happy, singing at their work, and roaming about the country during their leisure hours, exempt from the harrowing fear of starvation and murder, which is their normal condition in their islands. Some abuses were proved to have existed in the recruiting of one vessel, and the offenders were severely punished; but to condemn the whole system, as Mr. Paton and Bishop Barry do in the *Guardian*, is an act which is manifestly unjust.

The Rev. J. Mackintyre, the Presbyterian missionary in Mackay, recently baptised thirty-eight Kanakas out of a congregation of 200. His church is always full to overflowing, and at one of the meetings the boys subscribed £10 to the Mission funds.

Much good work is done among the wives of the planters, one of whom devotes her whole time to educating and Christianising the islanders. Mr Mackintyre writes:—

"This evident work of Divine grace is not confined to one plantation, but has spread over several, and the extraordinary success may well excite in every Christian heart the deepest gratitude to God."

At Maryborough there is an equally successful Mission. What do you think of all this for Queensland "slaves?" Bishop Barry knows nothing from personal acquaintance of the Kanaka labour, and the visits of Mr. Paton to Queensland were few and brief. But without my vindication, do English men and women think that Queenslanders are so bereft of morality and kindliness, that they can encourage an "inhuman traffic" in their midst? I think it is hard that we should be considered so much behind other Anglo-Saxon communities, in which the pressure of public opinion would not allow such an abuse to exist for a week; and to make an effort to fight against such an undeserved reputation, I write this letter, the length of which please to pardon, considering the importance of my subject.

CHARLES C. RAWSON.

Royal Colonial Institute, Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C., April 23, 1892.

WINCHESTER DIOCESAN CONFERENCE meets in the County Hall, Winchester, to-day and to-morrow. After the opening address by the President his lordship will move :—

"That in the opinion of this conference it is desirable to sever altogether education work from the objects of the existing diocesan societies, and to create one diocesan board of education for the entire diocese."

This motion will be seconded by Canon Warburton. The President will next submit a letter to the conference from the Bishop of Salisbury relating to a proposition for appointing a canon lecturer for this and neighbouring dioceses. His lordship will also make a statement with respect to the proposed *Diocesan Chronicle*. This afternoon, after reports of committees have been submitted, the President will move :—

"That it be referred to the Council of the Winchester Diocesan Mission to consider and report to the Bishop on :—(*a*) The appointment of a permanent diocesan Missioner or Missioners (one of whom shall be paid, in addition to the Canon in charge of Mission work; (*b*) the organic connection of such Mission work with the Diocesan Society or societies; (*c*) the periodical arrangement of Quiet Days for Clergy, Church workers, and for lay folk generally."

This motion will be seconded by Canon Durst. The President will next move, and Mr. Melville Portal will second :—

"That it be referred to the Council of the Winchester Diocesan Mission to consider and report to the Bishop upon the whole subject of lay work in the diocese (including the question of training and examination of laymen applying to be licensed), and to frame a constitution, to be submitted to the Bishop, which on his final approval he shall put into execution without further delay."

To-morrow, at 8 a.m., there will be a celebration of the Holy Communion in the cathedral. On the assembling of the conference at 10.30 the President will move :—

"That, in the judgment of this conference, the time has arrived for organising one diocesan society, which shall embrace in its objects and activities the entire area of the diooese."

The following motions will also be discussed :—

"That the Bishop be requested to appoint a Board of Missions for the diocese, to stimulate and foster the support of foreign Missions."—Mr. J. C. Moberly.

"That, in her efforts to promote the welfare of the people, it is most desirable that the Church give earnest attention to the provision of wholesome means of recreation of mind and body for her children."—Rev. H. H. Pereira.

"That there is urgent need of a national system of pensions for the aged, in which the following points should be kept in view—(*a*) that the recipient of a pension should have contributed a material sum towards it; (*b*) that the system should be capable of becoming universal, if the people should hereafter see fit to make such self-help compulsory; (*c*) that it should, at the earliest possible date, set free the sums now spent in out-relief for the aged for assistance to the national pension fund."—Canon Awdry.—*The Guardian*, April 27th.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allsopp, Rev. Richard Winstanley, LL.B.; Vicar of Bishop's or West Lavington, Wilts.

Atkin, Rev. J. Worthington, M.A., Rector of Rathbarry, Diocese of Ross; Rector of St. Peter's, Cork.

Balleine, Rev. John Arthur; Rector of St. Brelade's, Jersey.

Barlow, Rev. H. T. E., M.A., Principal of Bishop Wilson Theological School, Isle of Man; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Carlisle.

Barton, Rev. J. Bernard, B.A.; Mission to Seamen Chaplain for the Port of Sunderland.

Baynham, Rev. Albert Edward, M.A.; Rector of Monkton Farley, Wilts.

Beevor, Rev. John Hare, Rector of Hevingham; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the deanery of Ingworth, Norwich.

Blaker, Rev. Walter Isaacson, M.A.; Vicar of Easlerton, Wilts.

Bodington, Rev. Herbert James, M.A.; Vicar of Honingham-with-East Tuddenham, Norfolk.

Bone, Rev. William Middleton, M.A.; Rector of Fonthill Bishop, Wilts.

Bowden, Rev. Charles E., Incumbent of All Saints', Glencarse, Perth; Vicar of Haydock St. Helens.

Bower, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Carlisle; Chaplain to the Bishop of Carlisle.

Campbell, Rev. H. E., M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Millom; Chaplain to the Bishop of Carlisle.

Carr, Rev. W. R., M.A., Vicar of St. John-in-Bedwardine, Worcester; Rural Dean of West Worcester Deanery.

Codling, Rev. Charles, Senior Curate of Tamworth; Incumbent of Kangaroo Point, Australia.

Cunningham, Rev. Henry Ward, Incumbent of Bridgetown, Nova Scotia; Rector of Christchurch, Springfield, U.S.A.

Davis, Rev. Weston Brocklesby, M.A., Vicar of Ramsbury, Wilts; Surrogate for the Diocese of Salisbury.

Deck, Rev. Henry Legh Richmond, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Wicker, Sheffield; Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

Dickson, Rev. William; Chaplain to the Royal Marines, Chatham.

Diggle, Rev. J. W., M.A., Honorary Canon of Liverpool; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Carlisle.

Dodsworth, Rev. William Wallace, M.A., Curate of the Church of the Annunciation, Chislehurst; Vicar of St. Olave's, Marygate, York.

Eden, Rev. H. C., M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Holy Innocents', Hammersmith.

Egremont, Rev. H. E., Vicar of St. James's, Milton, Hants; Vicar of Welton, Yorkshire.

Firth, Rev. G. W. Anson, Minor Canon of Durham Cathedral; Assistant-Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Durham.

Gill, Rev. Cecil Hope, M.A., Rector of Mowbray; Rector of Burghersdorp, Cape Colony.

Gill, Rev. Hugh Stowell, M.A., Vicar of Kirk Malew; Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.
Harbord, Hon. and Rev. John, M.A.; Rector of South Repps, Norfolk.
Hill, Rev. J. H. D., Vicar of East Ardsley; Rural Dean of Wakefield.
Holme, Rev. George F., M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Hulme; Vicar of St. Luke's, Chadderton, Oldham.
Irwin, Rev. William; Perpetual Curate of St. Michael and All Angels', Stonebridge, Willesden.
Lascelles, Rev. Maurice George, Curate of Horley; Vicar of Rocester, near Uttoxeter.
Lees, Rev. F. R., M.A.; Vicar of Wyken, Coventry.
Leigh, Rev. Howard Francis, M.A.; Vicar of Holywell, Oxford.
Liesching, Rev. Louis George Pett; Licensed to Officiate in the Mission Churches of St. Saviour's and Stoughton, in the parish of Stoke.
Lumby, Rev. J. R., D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Carlisle.
Marwood, Rev. George H., M.A.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Narcissus*.
Mullins, Rev. Charles R.; Chaplain to the *Swiftsure*.
Nash, Rev. Henry Haverlock Ashley, M.A.; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
O'Donoghue, Rev. Edward Geoffrey; Chaplain of Bethlehem Royal Hospital, Lambeth-road.
Pace, Rev. Henry Horatio; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Palmer, Rev. Prebendary C. S., M.A., Rector of Eardisley; Canon Residentiary in Hereford Cathedral.
Patterson, Rev. R. S., Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class; Chaplain to the Forces, First Class.
Phillips, Rev. Canon Thompson, M.A., Vicar of Ivegill; Honorary Secretary to the Carlisle Diocesan Clergy Aid Society, and the "Harvey Goodwin Rest Fund."
Pidcock, Rev. Benjamin C., M.A.; Chaplain to the Royal Marines, Plymouth.
Richmond, Rev. Canon Thomas K., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Carlisle; Chaplain to the Bishop of Carlisle.
Ross-Lewin, Rev. Robert O'D., M.A.; Chaplain to the Royal Marine Depôt, Walmer.
Sanders, Rev. Henry S., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Southampton; Vicar of St. James's, Milton, Hants.
Smyth, Rev. Arthur, M.A., LL.B.; Vicar of Sutton-in-the-Marsh.
Speechly, Right Rev. John M., D.D., formerly Bishop of Travancore; Vicar of Hernhill, Kent.
Stallard, Rev. A. G. B., M.A., Curate of Sutton-on-Plym; Vicar of St. Elwny, Hayle.
Tanqueray, Rev. Edward, B.A.; Rector of Manningford Bruce, Wilts.
Timbrell, Rev. Alfred Bell, Vicar of Cradley; Rector of Old Swinford, Stourbridge.
Turner, Rev. Henry Whitelock, M.A.; Rector of North Runcton-with-Hardwick and Setchy, Norfolk.
Wesley, Rev. Edmund A., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Chad's, Everton; Perpetual Curate of Holy Innocents', Myrtle-street, Liverpool, and Chaplain of the three Liverpool Orphan Asylums in Myrtle-street.
Wilkinson, Rev. Herbert, Vicar of Burton Dassett, Leamington; Vicar of Cropthorne, Pershore.
Williams, Rev. George Henry, M.A., Head-Master of Kendal Grammar-school; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Carlisle.
Wingate, Rev. William J., Vicar of St. Jude's, South Shields; Vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Marley-hill, Whickham, Durham.
Wright, Rev. O. C., B.A.; Rector of Barcheston, Warwickshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brock, Very Rev. Carey, M.A., for forty-two years Rector of St. Peter-in-the-Wood, Guernsey, at the Rectory, on Easter Monday, aged 67.

Grey, Rev. Frederick Thomas, at Wendon Rectory, on the 21st ult.

Lewis, Rev. David Phillips, M.A. Cantab., Rector of Llandrinio, and for thirty years Rural Dean of Pool, at Llandrinio Rectory, Oswestry, on the 17th ult., aged 72.

Pardoe, Rev. John, Rector of Graveley, at Graveley Rectory, Stevenage, on the 23rd ult., aged 53.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

REGENERATION.

By the Rev. J. REID, M.A., Rector of Newtownsaville, co. Tyrone.

Sermon Preached in Newtownsaville Church, on Sunday, February 7th, 1892.

"Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."—John iii. 3.

NICODEMUS, to whom these words were addressed, had just acknowledged that Jesus was "a Teacher come from God." As a proof of that he referred to His miracles. "No man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him." God would not work a miracle to attest a falsehood, or support an imposter, and when He gives a man power to work a miracle it is proof (generally) that He approves of that man's teaching. Thus the miracles of the Saviour were credentials of His divine mission. In this expression of belief in Jesus as a Teacher come from God, there was implied a readiness and willingness on the part of Nicodemus to be taught by Him. And though Nicodemus was a man of rank and education, our Lord began His instruction in religion by the statement of one of its fundamental truths: "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Thus He plainly and emphatically declared a change of heart and life to be indispensable to every man in order that he may enjoy eternal happiness. Here we have it solemnly affirmed by the Son of God, that there is no possibility of entering heaven without being born "from above" (ἀνωθεν). This is the New Birth or Regeneration, about which I wish to speak to you to-day. I need hardly tell you that this is a subject around which much controversy has gathered, and over which much ecclesiastical smoke has settled. One man understands and explains the subject in one way, and another in another way; while a third rushes in and says in effect to both, as the high priest Caiaphas did to the Jews: "Ye know nothing at all." And the consequence is that in their eagerness to enlighten, men are apt to obscure.

It is not my desire or intention to recount and reproduce the various arguments used on the one side or the other, and so add to the obscurity.

Believing that, as an old author says, the best way to see the sun is to put out our candle, I shall pass over with very little notice what this or that man may have said, and try to find out "What saith the Scripture" and what is most in accordance with reason and common sense.

We will not interpret the Holy Scriptures by the sayings of men and of Churches, but measure the teachings of Churches and men by the rule of God's own word.

It is admitted, and Holy Scripture abundantly proves that "all men are conceived and born in sin;" and our Lord has, as we have seen, declared in the most explicit manner, the absolute necessity of regeneration (or being born again), without which none can enter into the Kingdom of God. The word regeneration, which occurs only twice in the New Testament (Matt. xix. 28, Titus iii. 5), means properly new birth or renewal, reproduction, or re-creation.

Various terms are used to designate this change, such as "creating anew" (Eph. iv. 24), "begetting" (Jas. i. 18), "quickening" (John v. 21), etc., etc. "The word would appropriately be applied to any one in whom a new life was commenced in some way corresponding to his being made alive at the first" (Barnes). The controversy, or difference of opinion arises first as to when this new life is begun in man, whether it accompanies and results from baptism, or takes place at some later period of life. Let us try and examine the subject carefully, and with no other desire than to arrive at the truth, whether that truth corresponds with our hitherto cherished opinions or not.

Assuming that children or infants are proper subjects of baptism, as they are admitted to be by most sections of the Protestant Church (Baptists excepted), let us begin our inquiry with a consideration of the rite (of baptism) as applied to them, as it is with infant baptism the difficulty as to regeneration chiefly arises.

First let us ask the question. Is baptism a religious rite at all, or a purely secular one?

If baptism be a purely secular matter, and no more religious than the act of a person entering his name in the rent-book of his landlord to show that he is the owner (in part at least) of certain property, and has in consequence certain rights accruing to him, and certain duties devolving on him, but all of a purely secular kind—if it be thus, as I say, a purely secular matter, however the ceremony be performed and whatever rites may accompany it, then there is no more to be said on the subject, and no necessity for wrangling about it.

It does not in that case properly come within the domain of religion or religious controversy at all. It is like a person joining a temperance society, or a league or guild of some kind, and having themselves enrolled as members. But if the Sacrament be the emblem at least (if nothing more) of that spiritual regeneration which unites us both federally and spiritually to Christ, so that we have part with Him both in His life, and in His

death—if it be a covenanting ordinance whereby the recipient recognises and pledges his allegiance to God—if it be a solemn rite of initiation into the Christian Church, then coming thus within the domain of religion, and affecting man's spiritual welfare both here and hereafter, it must be considered from a religious standpoint, and the benefits, whatever they are, of which we are made partakers thereby, are of a spiritual kind, and to be described in the language of religion.

To be baptised in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost (Matt. xxviii. 19), or in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts xix. 5) is, in fact, by baptism, or by the inward and spiritual grace, of which the water is the outward and visible sign, to be "united to Christ as His disciples, believers in His doctrine, heirs of His promises, and partakers of His spiritual life" (Hodges "Outlines," page 486). It is to be "baptised by one spirit into one body" the Body of Christ which is His Church, of which body Christ Himself is the head. Hence we are taught to say in the Church Catechism that at our baptism we are made "members of Christ," as we are then made members or parts of His Body the Church (See Eph. iv. 12-16, v. 23, iii. 16, and i. 18-22 for "Body.")

That this is one result or effect of baptism, *i.e.*, making those who are baptised members of Christ's Body the Church, all are agreed. But is this all? We are not naturally members of God's family or Church, or Christ's Body, and the outward ordinance, and appointed means by which God receives us into His family is baptism.

Let us now turn to the Baptismal Service of the Church (of England and Ireland), and try and find out what it means, and what it is intended to teach us as to the effects or results of baptism.

Children or infants are brought to be baptised, and the Church wishing to watch over and safeguard every step of youth as a watchful spiritual mother, provides as far as can be done, for the careful training up of her children in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord," and sends them forth on the journey of life accompanied by her blessing. Hence she endeavours to make this initiatory step in their Christian life as solemn and impressive as possible. She provides, in her instructions, that the people "be admonished that it is most convenient that baptism should not be administered, but upon Sundays and other Holydays, when the most number of people come together, as well for that the congregation then present may testify the receiving of them that be newly baptised into the number of Christ's Church, as also because in the baptism of infants every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his baptism."

Thus the Church keeps in view a double service in the public baptism of children. First, the admitting of the infant (or adult) by the solemn rite into the fellowship of Christ's Church. Second, there is the design of reviving in the minds of those present their own profession made to God at their baptism. And I consider both are very necessary and very useful, as by thus having their minds "stirred up by way of remembrance," men may be led to renewed efforts to bring their practice more into harmony with their profession.

Let us now glance at the service itself. First, the congregation and sponsors, or parents, are reminded that all men are conceived and born in sin, and they are exhorted to "call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that the child may be baptised with water and the Holy Ghost," baptised with the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's Holy Church—His body—and be made a lively member of the same, a living member, a real living branch in Christ the living Vine.

Then the Minister and Congregation engage in prayer that God may "wash the child, and sanctify it with the Holy Ghost," and that being delivered—through being washed and sanctified—from God's wrath under which it was born, it "may be received into the ark of Christ's Church," as a place of safety, and that being "steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity" or love, it may safely "pass the waves of this troublesome" world, and finally "come to the land of everlasting life."

Then further we pray that the child "may receive remission of sins" that is of original sin, since no actual sin has, in the case of infants, been committed. That it may "enjoy the everlasting benediction of God's heavenly washing," that He may give His Holy Spirit to the infant that it may (of the Spirit) be born again and be made an heir of everlasting salvation through Christ. That the old Adam (or old sinful nature) may die, and that "all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in the child. That it may triumph against the world, the flesh, and the devil," the threefold embodiment of all spiritual enemies, such as "assault and hurt the soul." That the child may be "endued with heavenly virtues" and in the end be "everlastingly rewarded through God's mercy."

We pray further that God may regard—or hear and answer—the supplications of His people, sanctify the water to the mystical washing away of sin, and that He may grant that the child about to be baptised may "receive the fulness of His grace" and may "ever remain in the number of His faithful and elect children."

Now the Church and its service assume that people who thus pray are honest and sincere, and mean what they say, and in order to encourage them to hope for answers to their prayers they are reminded of Christ's promise, "Ask, and ye shall have; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you."

And forasmuch as Minister, sponsors (whether they be the child's parents or others), and congregation have offered up all these prayers in Christ's name, and in reliance on His promises, believing that God has in His Gospel promised all these blessings and has He not? — therefore God being willing to grant them, and they being sincere, or supposed to be, in asking them, it is consistently assumed as a matter of course that God will, and does give the blessings prayed for. The service not being intended or constructed for hypocrites or pretenders, but for people who mean what they say, and say what they mean, proceeds on this assumption, and in the confident belief that God is as good as His word of promise. And forasmuch as the blessings asked for are spiritual blessings, and in accordance with God's will and within His power, faith relies on God's promise that "Whatsoever ye shall ask in My name, I will do it:" "which promise He for His part will most surely keep and perform."

> "Faith, mighty faith, the promise sees,
> And looks to that alone."

And now comes the crucial point where a split takes place and the controversy begins. The Church believes that God will and does bestow the blessings His people have prayed for. And the water or outward and visible sign being applied in the name of the sacred Trinity, and so everything being done on man's part that can be done and as it should be done, the Church in the continuation of the service, thanks God for doing what has been prayed for, and what He has promised to do, or what we may assume to be in accordance with His will to do. Thus, "We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit [not with water, be it observed, as some affirm that we say, but with the Holy Spirit], to receive him (or her) for Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into Thy holy Church."

Thus it is assumed and asserted that the child after baptism is "regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church."

To this assertion and assumption strong objections are made by some. Let us therefore consider this point a little more fully, and see what the objections amount to.

Are infants, whose faculties are only in the germ, capable of being regenerated? That they are by nature born in sin is admitted. Are they, then, while in their immature state capable of regeneration?

It is admitted that infants may be the subjects of regeneration in exactly the same way as adults. It being admitted then, that infants are susceptible of regeneration, and regeneration being a work of the Holy Spirit, or being the result of the infusion of God's grace into the soul, the question arises, How much grace, or divine power, or of the Holy Spirit, is necessary to regenerate an infant? Here is the kernel of the whole matter.

There are only three feasible or practical views, so far as I can see, that can be taken of this matter, *i.e.*, of baptism and its relation to regeneration: first, the purely secular one, which I have already stated, where no religious element is involved; second, the view which looks upon baptism as a solemn religious rite, by which people are initiated into the Christian Church and dedicated to God and His service, but which hesitates to go so far, or affirm so much, in reference to the baptised infant, as our Church Service does.

I do not wish to speak unkindly or uncharitably of the opinions of any. My object is, if possible, to combine the force of truth with the sweetness of charity. But this middle halting view presents itself to me somewhat thus: Assuming that the child is solemnly dedicated to God by some kind of Christian rites and ceremonies, and earnest prayer offered for God's blessing to rest upon it and be its portion, it seems to me as if people prayed and hoped timidly, thus, "O Lord, we have solemnly dedicated this child to Thee and to Thy service; we have baptised it in Thy name, O Triune Jehovah. We have prayed that it may be a partaker of all the benefits of Thy covenant of grace; that it may enjoy the washing of regeneration and and renewing of the Holy Ghost; that it may die to sin and live unto holiness here, and finally by Thy mercy obtain everlasting life; but, O Lord, we would not venture to hope that Thou wilt give this great blessing of being born again just now. So much grace, and such a great blessing as this we do not hope for, and cannot be sure of just yet. But by-and-bye, Lord, some time, in Thine own good time, may it please Thee to regenerate this child, and make him (or her) Thine own child by adoption, by bestowing upon him such a measure of Thy grace as will be sufficient to accomplish that great work.

"We have prayed, Lord, that the child may be born again, and blessed with the fulness of Thy grace in all manner of spiritual blessing; but, O Lord, we would not be too confident, since we know not what or how much to ask, in believing and proclaiming that Thou hast done as we have asked and Thou hast promised, therefore we leave it to the future to disclose whether Thou hast kept Thy promise to give to those who ask, and to open the door to those who knock, and answered our prayers for this child in making him 'a new creature in Christ Jesus.'"

This I say is the way this hesitating, undecided, uncertain view of the matter presents itself to my mind, and I think it is not an unfair representation of it. It seems to me to have about it too much of the tone of St. Augustine when he prayed, "O Lord, convert me, but not now."

The third view is that set forth in the Baptismal Service of our Church, which assumes that every-

thing being done on man's part "as God wills and commands it to be done," He will and does give the blessings asked for, not merely some grace or blessing, or a little of the Spirit, but the fulness of His grace, and returns thanks to Him for doing so.

At the end of the Service the Sponsors or Sureties are reminded that "baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and be made like unto Him. That as He died and rose again for us, so should we who are baptised die to rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."

If men do this they will give the best evidence that they are born again, and there will be then no fear but in the end, "with the residue of His Holy Church, they will inherit His everlasting kingdom."

These three views of the matter include all others, and may be briefly stated thus:

1st. No religion at all, the rite wholly secular.

2nd. Religion and blessing, but only a small portion, not so much as to make sure of regenerating at once.

3rd. Ask enough, believe that you get it, and act accordingly.

In every case the regeneration of a human being, infant or adult, is the work of the Holy Spirit. It is "according to the working of God's mighty power." All man can do is to use the means God has prescribed and approved, and believe and look for the blessing in the use of those means. Just as a farmer ploughs his ground now in the spring-time, and sows his seed, and applies fertilisers, and does his best to keep down and destroy weeds, and looks to and depends upon God to make it germinate and grow and produce a harvest. There may and probably will be some weeds even in the best cultivated field, but the presence of these does not prove that there is no crop there, any more than their absence would prove that there is.

It may be further noticed that in the Holy Scriptures various agencies and influences are referred to as producing or contributing to produce this change (regeneration). Thus in 1 Peter i. 23, we are said to be "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." "Not of corruptible seed," here doubtless means, not of human parentage. Not by natural birth, or human descent, does this great blessing come to us, but by the Word of God, which is made the instrument of quickening the soul to spiritual life.

So in St. James (i. 18), we have a similiar statement. "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth." Here, again, the Divine Word or "Word of Truth," is stated to be the instrument used by the Holy Spirit in man's regeneration, or quickening to spiritual life. So St. Paul says in writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 15), "I have begotten you through the Gospel." That is, I was the instrument of your conversion from heathenism, through God's blessing on the Gospel which I preached unto you.

No doubt much of the language of the New Testament on this subject referred to adults and to those who had been brought up in heathenism. With them the transition from the death of sin to the life of righteousness was in many respects more marked than it can be with those who are surrounded by a Christian atmosphere, habits and practices, from their early years. The adult heathen converts entered the Church by baptism, as they still do, having professed faith in Christ, and a desire to be His followers and servants; and they were expected to evidence the reality of their faith and the sincerity of their profession by a life of holiness. They were "buried with Him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, they also should walk in newness of life." Which means that by the solemn profession made at baptism Christians become dead to sin, as Christ was dead to the living world around Him when He lay in the grave, and that as He rose to new life, so should we who are baptised die to sin and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living. So also Col. ii. 12, "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God Who raised Him from the dead."

I have now placed before you the only possible theories of Regeneration—since all others are included in these—and ask you to consider them prayerfully for yourselves. Exercise your own judgment, and see which is most honouring to God and comforting to man, and which is most in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture, and the dictates of reason and common sense.

There is one thing about the objections urged against baptismal regeneration that has often struck me as very strange; it is so unlike the way in which people reason and act in other matters.

All acts of religion have as one of their objects and results the procuring, directly or indirectly, of some advantage or blessing for ourselves. Baptism is a religious act, and has for its object the procuring of some blessing for the baptised. Why then are people so much afraid of obtaining a large and abundant blessing, especially in a matter where it is a virtue to be covetous? Why be satisfied with a little when they might have much? If they are satisfied to ask some of God's grace and spirit for a child, why not ask enough?

Has God fixed any limit, or drawn any line at which we are to stop when we ask for things in accordance with His will?

If a child is ever to be regenerated, is it not "the

sooner the better"? Or if some are content to ask only a little, and believe that God gives only a little, why find fault with others who have larger faith and confidence in God's liberality? In temporal things, people are universally anxious to obtain for themselves and their children all that they can. They won't be satisfied with ten acres where they can have fifty, nor with a hundred pounds when they can have a thousand. But once we enter the domain of spiritual matters, it looks as if people (some people at least) were afraid of themselves or their neighbours obtaining too much.

Thus men are disposed in the most solemn acts of religion, and especially in this the first of all blessings publicly sought for a child just on the threshold of life, to play the cynical part of neither seeking large blessings for themselves nor allowing others to do so. And when they do seek and believe they have obtained, men affect to believe they have not, which is only another way of saying that the minister, parents, and congregation were all insincere in asking, and that God does not fulfil His own promise, that whatever two or three shall agree in asking—especially of spiritual blessings, and things in accordance with His will—they shall receive.

But if you see a man or woman living a careless and irreligious life, how can you say that they were regenerated at their baptism? Is not their life a proof that they were not?

This does not necessarily prove that, any more than an unfruitful branch proves that it never was joined properly to, or grafted into the vine.

In that beautiful parable in the fifteenth of St. John, where our Lord speaks of Himself as the true Vine, He says, "Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit He taketh away." Here He speaks of branches being in Him, and yet not bearing fruit. There are alas, I fear, many such! Why? Not because they had never been grafted, but because, like Esau, they despise their birthright.

Many causes may contribute to this. First, though the admission to the membership of Christ's Church, was by a solemn, religious rite intended for people who are really sincere and earnest (and no sane person would think of having a service, either precomposed, or extempore, on the supposition that the users only meant it as a joke), too often it is to be feared the sincerity and earnestness are wanting, on the part of some at least.

This is not the fault of the service, but of the people, just as it is not the fault of the Bible, God's own book of truth, that men read it and don't profit by it.

They are not "sanctified through the truth," or made "wise unto salvation" thereby, because they do not, like David, "hide it in their hearts," or as the Apostle James says, "receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save their souls."

The Bible, like the Baptismal Service, is written for people who are in earnest, and such it is able to make wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ.

This is one reason why people lead careless lives, they don't think of what they have pledged themselves to. Hence the Church desires baptism to be performed in the congregation, that those who have become careless or lukewarm may be reminded of their privilege and their duty.

Another cause of the inconsistency between the beginning and the continuance of life, is that parents and sponsors do not in many cases follow and obey the Divine command, "Train up a child in the way he should go," depending on the promise of God, that "when he is old he will not depart from it." Instead of thus training them up in the way they should go, too often they are allowed to go in almost any way they please. They neither have a good example set them at home, nor good moral, and religious precepts instilled into their minds. Their experience of religion in their own homes is much the same as that of the boy who when asked, "Is your father a Christian?" replied, "Yes, sir; but I believe he has not worked much at it lately."

On this subject, the training of children, an excellent pamphlet was written and published many years ago by the present Bishop of Liverpool (Dr. Ryle), called, "How should a child be trained?" I would earnestly recommend all parents to procure this tract, read it carefully, and act upon the suggestions it contains; and if they did, I am convinced that there would be much less breaking away from youthful promise than there is. Young people, by the blessing of God, would grow up from their infancy in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord," and show by their lives that they really are "members of Christ and children of God, and consequently inheritors of the kingdom of heaven."

Another difficulty in the way of accepting this doctrine of baptismal regeneration in all its fulness is the doctrine of predestination, or a limited atonement. "The design of baptism," says Dr. Hodge, "is primarily to signify, seal and convey to those to whom they belong, the benefits of the covenant of grace." Here baptismal regeneration is admitted as regards some. But if Christ did not die for all, and if some are predestined to everlasting misery, it would not well square with this to admit the possibility of their being regenerated, consequently it is limited to those to whom they (*i.e.*, the blessings) belong.

So also in the Westminster Confession, chap. 28, sections 5 and 6, it is affirmed that, "by the right use of this ordinance (*i.e.*, baptism), the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto," but a saving clause is added, which says

that, "baptism does not in all cases secure the blessings of the covenant, and that in the cases in which it does (secure the blessings) the gift is not necessarily connected in time with the administration of the ordinance." The first part of this statement, viz., that baptism does not in all cases secure the blessings, etc., depends on, or is qualified by the other statement "such as that grace belongeth unto;" and since all are not saved and never can be, some being, according to this doctrine, predestined to eternal death; and since, "if once in grace always in grace," or they were bound to persevere, and be saved, it would be inconsistent to admit that all receive the benefits who undergo the rite

The latter part of the statement, that "the gift is not necessarily connected in time with the administration of the ordinance" has been dealt with already in what I have said upon the second theory of baptism, though I had not the statement in this definite form before my mind when treating of that point.

Regeneration and conversion are often confounded one with the other, and this occasions much confusion of thought and misunderstanding. The terms are not convertible, nor are the processes described by them the same. Conversion is the act of a penitent soul in turning from sin to God and holiness, and may take place before, in, or after baptism, or as often as a man falls into sin and goes astray, whereas regeneration takes place once only, and is not repeated. Of conversion I shall speak more fully on next Sunday, when I shall treat of that subject specially. I must conclude now by saying that at whatever time this regeneration takes place, it must take place some time before a man can enter the heavenly home, for the Saviour has emphatically declared, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

DR. AINLEY, Medical Officer of Health for Halifax, has written to the Secretary of the Funeral Reform Association detailing his experience, while removing bodies from an old burying-ground at Halifax, of the difference between burial in the plain earth and in vaults. The bodies buried simply, in perishable coffins in the earth, had completely disappeared, with the exception of the bones and in some cases the hair; whereas the condition within the vaults was indescribably shocking. In the process of digging up the earthen graves there was an entire absence of odour, except such as is experienced in turning up fresh soil, so thoroughly had nature done her work; whereas, when the vaults were opened, the odour was insufferably sickening. In one instance of vault burial, in which the lid of the coffin was accidentally knocked off, the excavators had to run twenty or thirty yards away, and a large quantity of disinfectants had to be used before operations could be resumed. The coffin in this case was found to be nearly filled with a dirty-looking fluid, the product of putrefaction, on the surface of which the shroud floated.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1892.

MAY DAY IN HYDE PARK.

MANY of our readers will, like ourselves, have been witnesses of the great demonstration of last Sunday; for all classes of Londoners were there. The spectators in the streets through which the procession passed, and in the park itself, were many times more numerous than the demonstrators themselves, and included all classes of the population. The windows in the grand houses, which line one side of Grosvenor-place, were full of aristocratic spectators, and the crowds in the streets were chiefly composed of the respectable middle class, while the processionists themselves were evidently real sons of daily toil, bearing on their faces and their forms the traces of hard, and in many cases of painful, ill-requited labour. We propose to give our readers to-day the impression made by the sight upon one amongst the crowd.

The present writer had been for that day a member of the congregation of St. Margaret's, Westminster, and had there heard from Dr. Farrar a very eloquent (if that epithet may be applied to an elaborately written discourse) and a very intemperate sermon on temperance. The preacher had left the impression on his hearers' minds that intemperance in liquor is the cause, and almost the sole cause, of vice and crime, instead of being, as it really is, one of the effects—the attempted consolation, but the actual aggravation—of the sufferings which are entailed upon man by the breach of other laws of God. And he had suggested the idea that the picture traced in his text (Isaiah xxviii. 7, 8) was a true one of contemporary England. Fresh from this sermon, one of his hearers went out on the Embankment, where the great procession was already assembling; he walked

along it to near the Temple, carefully scrutinising its members; he then cut across to Hyde Park Corner, and saw it enter there, and spent his time in watching it in different parts till 5 p.m. Neither amongst the demonstrators, nor amongst the spectators, who must, when taken together, have numbered some hundreds of thousands, did he observe the smallest sign of intemperance. There was no rowdyism, no rough conduct, no bad words. Once a bandsman, like many of his craft a thirsty soul, produced a spirit bottle, and put it to his mouth. So unusual was the sight, that it provoked a shout of derisive laughter from the lookers-on. Here was the whole population of London gathered, from the superior class to the very dregs, and the most impressive thing about the whole scene was the absence of all intemperance, and the perfect order and good discipline that prevailed. Surely this was a contradiction to the pessimistic pictures drawn by professed philanthropists like Dr. Farrar.

In a vast demonstration like this, it is only a small fraction of what was to be seen and heard, that one pair of eyes could see, or one pair of ears hear. Of the sixteen brakes or waggons, which were euphemistically entitled platforms, the writer of this could only attach himself to one—No. 14. The chairman was a Dr. Aveling. The writer of this, not having the *entrée* into Social-democratic circles, knows nothing of this gentleman except what he saw last Sunday. He watched the heroes of the day with a mind as open to impressions as that of Mr. Gladstone himself: and (he knows not why) this gentleman's physiognomy made him think sometimes of the "lean Cassius," and sometimes of Mephistopheles. He had a very clear voice and a very distinct utterance, and very pronounced opinions. His International associates reproached him sometimes, he said, with being content to claim only an eight-hour day, when they themselves wanted labour to be limited to six hours. To this he answered that he was quite ready, if it were practicable, to go in for four. It was not quite clear whether this was intended for joke or earnest; but it must be plain that, if this compulsory limitation of the hours of labour proceeds much farther, our people will be converted into mere idlers, and the proud boast that the Englishman is the best worker in the world will disappear. As this 14th was the International platform, a large part of the speakers were foreigners, who had not quite mastered the difficulties of our language. One lady especially, the wife of Mr. Cunninghame Graham, M.P., but herself a Spaniard, delivered, like Dr. Farrar, a fully written oration, in which occasionally she lost her place. Her opinions were extreme, though her manner amiable; and she was heartily applauded by spectators as well as demonstrators. The enthusiasm shown by the hearers of these addresses was only slight. The cause of this coldness apparently was that the mere indifferent spectators were upon the ground before the processions, and thus secured for themselves most of the places nearest to the platforms. The subject of all the speeches was the Eight Hours Legal Day. The wire-pullers of the movement have shown great wisdom in placing before the working-class one single object, and that one which they can thoroughly understand and appreciate. What is desired is a positive legal enactment, prohibiting any employment from being continued longer than eight hours. This is to be imposed as a test upon every candidate at the next general election; and there can be little doubt that most candidates whose seats depend on working-class votes will swallow it, whether they like it or no. No one can doubt that Mr. Gladstone will conform, if he thinks that doing so will gain him another lease of power. And other wire-pullers, as well as Dr. Aveling, frankly confess that they only look upon this as the thin end of the wedge, to be followed by other enactments equally despotic, supposed to be favourable to the interests of labour, and adverse to those of capital. All the speakers expressed great confidence that power is now in the hands of the working-class, and that they need only demand in order to have.

Looking back on the whole scene, we see much that is encouraging, and also much that is very dangerous. The most encouraging point is the demeanour of the vast multitude—quiet, sober, moderate, peaceful—far superior to their wire-pullers and orators. The great danger is the evident hostility which was there displayed—and again more by the wire-pullers than by the men—of what the French orators call the proletariat against the capitalist employers. The doctrine preached was, that henceforth national differences are to be nothing, religious differences nothing, and the only difference and the only conflict yet remaining is to be that between capital and labour. This is a threat of the civil war of classes inhabiting the same country, which is, of all forms of warfare, the most dangerous.

We hope that the instinctive moderation of the English race will assert itself once more, and ward off the impending evils. But, if such a deliverance is to be, politicians on both sides must face the fact that we are treading on very dangerous ground, and that exaggerations of speech, and, still more, selfish partisanship, may increase the dangers, and bring on a catastrophe. And they must learn (what a sight of these endless trains of labouring men should be enough to teach) that their condition needs improvement, and that such improvement is the one paramount question of the day.

THE Roman Catholic Archbishop-elect of Westminster has written to the Secretary of the Funeral Reform Association as follows:—"I beg to express my cordial sympathy with the much needed work of reform which your Society has been founded to promote."

THE TRIPARTITE NATURE OF MAN.

By the Rev. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A.

A Paper read before the Bath Clerical Society.

The subject of the threefold nature of man is, of course, only a part of the larger subject of psychology, a science which has not received from theologians the attention which it deserves. The result of this neglect has been a lack of scientific system in theology in connection with the nature and the needs of man. For the science of human nature is second only to that of the divine nature, and the ancient motto, "Know thyself," sets forth the necessary preliminary to the great knowledge of all, which is to know God. In particular we shall see how helpful our subject is in the study of various doctrines of the Christian faith, being, as it is, their necessary complement. The doctrine of the tripartite nature of man is itself a Bible truth—a doctrine of God's own revelation to men. The division of man's nature into body and soul is a common philosophical one, but it is the Word of God alone that can pierce to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit (Heb. iv. 12), revealing the secret of man's inmost being. Never did philosopher analyze man's constitution and character more accurately than Aristotle, and yet he failed to discern the spirit in man, thereby proving that man is unable to find out man, even as by searching he is unable to find out God. Indeed all the advocates of the human trichotomy have been Jewish and Christian writers acquainted with the Holy Scriptures as the translators of the Septuagint; Philo, Josephus, and the Rabbinical writers, representing Jewish thought; and Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Clement, of Alexandria, and Origen, representing Christian thought. Unfortunately, however, the errors which incidentally arose out of this doctrine, as the confounding of the human spirit in Christ with divine, which gave rise to the Apollinarian heresy, brought the truth into disfavour, and coming as it did in such questionable guise, the Latin fathers rejected it. Augustine was its chief opponent, and owing to his influence it has never obtained in theology that indispensable place which it claims. The writers of the Reformation period, following the lead of Augustine, taught the dichotomist theory of body and soul, and to this day that is the common teaching of popular theology. Many German theologians, as Olshausen and Meyer, and notably Delitzsch, have expounded the true Scriptural doctrine of the trichotomy; but, in our own country, Bishop Ellicott,* and the Rev. J. B. Heard,† are almost the only writers that have devoted special attention to this subject. Therein lies open to us a field of theological thought which needs and which will richly repay careful cultivation.

To come now to a brief statement of the doctrine before us. Man is a composite being, his body representing the outward faculty of what may be called sense-consciousness; his soul (ψυχή) representing the inward faculty of self-consciousness, and his spirit (πνεῦμα) representing the moral faculty of God-consciousness. His body connects him with creation animate and inanimate, his spirit unites him to the Divine Creator, while his soul holds body and spirit together in the personality of human life. His body is the organ of the soul which dwells mysteriously within it, though we cannot, like Plato, localize it in the brain, or, indeed, anywhere else. As the body puts us in touch with the visible world without, so the soul makes us realise the invisible world within. It is the *Ego* of thought, and will, and feeling, and action, the real centre of our being, the true and responsible self.

> "Where I so tall to reach the Pole,
> Or grasp the ocean with a span;
> I must be measured by my *soul*,
> The *mind*'s the standard of the man."

"As (a man) thinketh in his *heart*," says Solomon, "so is he" (Prov. xxiii. 7). In these quotations we observe that two other terms, "heart" and "mind," occur, where the more comprehensive term "soul" might be used. They indicate, however, special parts of physical action, and often they are used interchangeably of man's higher life, and of the spirit also. The Hebrews always regarded the heart as the seat of thought and feeling, and popular usage has established this familiar and favourite fiction. We may, therefore, adopt the term "heart" to denote the sentient and volitive powers of the soul. The word "mind"—according to its derivation "the thinking faculty"—may be suitably used to denote the reflective and reasoning powers of the soul. So far man is not only lower than the angels of heaven, he is not a hairbreadth above the animals of earth, save in a greater cleverness; and were this the whole truth, evolution might claim man as its prize and crown. It is not reason and thought that distinguish man from the lower creation, for these are seen to exist there, as illustrated day by day in man's faithful companions and servants, the horse and the dog. As the Rev. J. B. Heard says, "This distinction can be maintained no longer" (p. 162). "Conscience, and not pure reason, is the distinguishing mark between man and the brute" (p. 171). As within the body dwells the soul, so within the soul, and not separate from it, dwells the God-begotten spirit (Heb. xii. 9). To use the familiar and instructive illustration given us by the Apostle Paul, man is God's Temple (1 Cor. vi. 19). The body is the outer building, the soul the sanctuary, and the spirit the Holy of Holies, the secret place of God's pavilion in man. In the spirit, therefore, and not in the soul, we find ourselves separated from the animal race by an immeasurable and impassable height placed far above the selections and survivals of evolution, yea, in the very presence-chamber of Jehovah. The moral faculty, the God-consciousness, the worshipful inclination within, indicate our origin. God is our Father. We are from above. Let us, however, remember that we see not the spirit as it might have been in man—as it was in Christ—as it will be in all the subjects of His grace—delighting itself in all the glories of the divine power, all the riches of the divine goodness, and all the excellencies of the divine character. Its growth and development were cut short by sin in the days of its infant experience, and it bears testimony to the presence of disorder and sin in the name "conscience," whereby we describe its present action and character. Satan's temptation in the garden won a victory for the lust of self over the divine rule, for the psychical or natural over the spiritual, which has delayed the reign of the

* Sermon 5, on 1 Thess. v. 23, in "The Destiny of the Creature."

† "The Tripartite Nature of Man": T. & T. Clarke, Edinburgh. These two valuable works were used for the present paper.

spirit in man for thousands of years. The soul instead of casting in its lot with the spirit in communion with God chooses to have its portion with the body in the life of the world; and body and soul form the league of "the flesh," as the earthly nature is called in Scripture, and the spirit is for the high purposes for which it was made actually dead. To revert to the figure used before, the Temple courts are thronged by haggling buyers and sellers, the Sanctuary is occupied by worldly avaricious priests, and though "the abomination that maketh desolate" may not yet be set up in the Most Holy Place, its ancient glory has departed.

Such I believe is a brief and fairly accurate statement of the tripartite nature of man as set forth in Holy Scripture. I should like to refer to several of the cardinal texts therein that prove this doctrine before concluding with a reference to the uses and applications of it.

It is in the New Testament, which tells of the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit, that the clearest revelations of this truth are given. Yet in the first page of human history the origin of man is described in harmony with it. In Gen. ii. 7, we read of man that "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." The same truth is implied in Eccles. xii. 7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Accepting the principle that the Bible represents a progressive revelation of God, we must understand these texts as interpreted by the more explicit statements of the New Testament. From the union of the two diverse elements, flesh and spirit, arises the soul (ἡ ψυχή), which we may describe in this connection as the active and intelligent principle of human life. Our Lord's teaching concerning the soul (Matt. x. 28, Matt. xvi. 26, Luke xii. 20) and spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα, John iii. 1–8, iv. 23, 24), contained in it the germs of all later Scriptural teaching of man's threefold nature as set forth in the Epistles. St. Jude (19) describes the twice-dead deceivers in the Church as sensual (ψυσικὸς, psychic or soullish), this being explained by the following clause, "having not the spirit." Conscience itself had perished within them, and they were twice dead. St. James traces this perverted soul-life to its ultimate cause when he speaks of the wisdom of envious striving as "earthly, sensual, devilish" (James iii. 15); and St. Paul, in a well known passage, points out the only way of restoration for the natural (psychic) man wandering as in a maze among the things of the Spirit of God, when he says, "The natural (ψυχικὸς) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. ii. 14). To convict of sin that Holy Spirit commonly uses the Word—the only discoverer of the spirit, which lying within the deepest recesses of man's nature, like the marrow within the joints, and hardly suspected by man himself, is suddenly shown to view as in a mirror with all his sins and misdeeds brought to remembrance (see Heb. iv. 12). Again, in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians, when praying for their perfect holiness, the Apostle desires that they may receive not only an entire (ὁλοτελὲς), but a complete (ὁλόκληρον) sanctification in the final preservation of body, soul, and spirit, the integral parts of human nature (1 Thess. v. 23). In 1 Cor. xv., writing of the final triumph of redemption, he declares the fulfilment of God's ancient purpose concerning man when he says, "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual; but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. . . . The first man, Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 46, 45). The disembodied state wherein the soul has been free to serve the spirit without those hindrances that bodily union entailed has been a preparation for the great and glorious end. Then at the resurrection the saints shall be clothed with bodies of glory like unto the Lord's body of glory (Phil. iii. 21); their souls shall be in perfect subjection to their spirits, and they shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

It remains to note some uses of this doctrine of the human trichotomy. (1.) It enables us to estimate original sin more correctly than if we take the dichotomist view, which fails to show how a man can be dead in trespasses and sins, and yet at the same time be active and lively in all the ordinary concerns of the world. (2.) It gives precision and clearness to the doctrine of the New Birth. Man's spirit needs the restorative power of the Spirit of God in the application of Christ's gracious work to the sinner's needs. (3.) It will help us in contemplating the operations of the Holy Spirit within us, and also in meeting the subtle and various temptations of the Evil One.

"Nine-tenths of the hasty assertions," says Bishop Ellicott, "which we have seen put forth upon these doctrines (eschatology and the Atonement), would have been completely avoided if a little more attention had been paid to the fundamental constitution of our common nature, and independence of its three mysterious components—body, soul, and spirit."

Reviews and Notices.

MEMORIAL TO VISCOUNT CROSS, from the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade. "SUBSTITUTES FOR THE OPIUM REVENUE." By T. G. Alexander. King & Son. "THE OPIUM TRADE, AS AFFECTING BRITISH COMMERCE WITH CHINA." By David McLaren. King & Son.

THE question treated in these papers, which have been sent to us for review, seems to contain two principal points—first, the moral character of the connection, which actually exists between the British Indian Government, and the cultivation, manufacture, and sale of opium; and, secondly, if the morality of the present practice be condemned, and the connection put an end to, the means that must be taken to supply the deficiency thus created in the revenue.

At present the cultivation of the poppy is a Government monopoly in all Indian provinces directly subject to the British crown. The Government assists the peasants to grow the plant by means of large advances of money; it purchases from them their whole crop, prohibiting them from selling to any other customer; it manufactures the drug in large factories of its own; it sells the manufactured product at a large profit; and, by a treaty extorted by a war, it has secured its admission into China, which country is its largest market. It also sells, and licenses the retailing of, the drug in India to its own subjects. The opium raised and manufactured in native States is admitted at the British frontiers on payment of a duty, which places it on a level with that grown on directly British ground, and is purchased and sold by the Government. Thus the whole production and distribution of this commodity is the work of the

Indian Government, and, therefore, the responsibility of that Government for all the effects of its consumption is as complete as can possibly be imagined.

Turning first to the moral side of the question, we find that it is generally admitted by the best medical authorities that, with the exception of the small quantities prescribed in medical practice, the whole effect of the use of the drug is to inflict physical, mental, and moral injury upon the persons who eat, drink, or smoke it. It is, in fact, a poison of a very insidious and deleterious kind. Such being the case, the question rises, Can a Government be justified in growing, manufacturing, and trading in such a poison, to say nothing of compelling other and unwilling nations to admit it by force of arms? To this question we can see no possible answer except an emphatic negative.

There remains the great difficulty of supplying the place of the profits which conscience requires the Government to sacrifice, and this is the great impediment in the way of practical Statesmen, who would gladly be rid of their connection with opium if they could. These profits form a large part of the revenue of the State, and amount each year, according to the highest estimate, to five and a-half millions of pounds, and, according to the lowest, to not less than three millions. It is to this point that the publications, which we have now under review, address themselves. Mr. Alexander's pamphlet especially enters into the whole subject of Indian finance, and attempts to show how, by economies in expenditare, and by opening out other sources of income, much of the loss might be supplied. But he admits that a large subvention, which he estimates at ten millions, to be spread over the next eight years, would be required from the British taxpayers. Not being experts in Indian finance, we cannot pretend to pronounce an opinion on the correctness of his calculations. But, standing on the moral ground alone, we must say that so flagitious and destructive a source of revenue ought, with the shortest possible delay, to be sacrificed, and that it is quite inconceivable that Statesmanship cannot devise a means for supplying the necessities of the State without incurring the national guilt of so grievous a violation of the law of conscience as is involved in the production and commercial exploitation of this baneful drug.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION *VERSUS* AIONIAL PURGATORY.

SIR,—I do not know what "J. B." wants "an explicit reply to," nor how he wants "a more explicit reply" than I have already given to any question he has asked. I showed him in my last that his perplexity in endeavouring to understand my letter of April 9th arose "from his dividing a question of mine in two, and trying to answer the latter half without taking the former into consideration." I removed his perplexity by making my question somewhat clearer. He has, accordingly, answered my question in a way I shall notice presently. But still he wants "a more explicit reply" to the statement of his perplexity, which I understand has been removed and no longer exists. Is this reasonable on his part?

It appears now that "J. B." inferred that I hold "the doctrine of annihilation or extinction of being," not from the Scriptural terms in which I expressed what I believed about the wrath to come, but from my putting one of those terms, viz., "eternal destruction," in contradistinction to "aionial purgatory and endless torment." But why did he not say in reply to that—what, it seems, he holds—that "eternal destruction" *is* "aionial purgatory?" Why did he not protest against my putting a difference between things which are identical in meaning? I must say that I consider those two things that I contrasted are just about as different as any two things can be, and that if they are identical, Scripture language is so vague and loose that it can teach us nothing—on that subject at least.

I am reminded of what was written a few years ago by one with whom I imagine "J. B." is more or less in sympathy on the question before us—I mean the late Dean Stanley writing as "*Anglicanus*" in the *Contemporary Review*, of April, 1878:—"Adhere to the letter, and . . . . the annihilation of the wicked is the doctrine of Scripture." ". . . . the literal sense means—annihilation." "If we are to be bound by the letter, then unquestionably 'annihilation' for all guilty souls is the doctrine of Scripture." "*Anglicanus*," however, scorned to be bound by the letter of Scripture, and so spake of what he admits is the Scriptural doctrine of "annihilation" as "hideous." And yet, curiously enough, he comes round presently himself to that "hideous" but Scriptural doctrine as follows:—"This only will I say, that if there be some souls—very few indeed they are likely to be—who cannot be reclaimed by any or all of the infinitely wise methods which Divine love can apply . . . . then it would become the Almighty to extinguish those perverse and irreclaimable spirits," etc.

Archdeacon Farrar, too, in his "Eternal Hope," referring to our Lord's words in Matt. x. 28, says God "*can* destroy the soul, but it says not that He *will*. If any think that this is implied"—as "J. B." seems to think as well as I, neither of us believing that our Lord held out an idle threat that would never be fulfilled to His disciples—"it seems to me that no logical course is open to them but to embrace the doctrine of Conditional Immortality." I may mention that some opponents of that doctrine call me and others who hold it "Destructionists"—as believing in "eternal destruction"—just as "J. B." would probably call us "Annihilationists." Of the two we prefer the more Scriptural term, even as a term of reproach.

I would repeat my request that "J. B." would show us where and how "the Scriptures indicate clearly that immortality is conferred on intelligent beings"—or, as he now explains, on "all the race of Adam without exception," even of the idiots—"and will be sustained." One sentence of Scripture to this effect will have more weight with me—and I should think with any Christian—than any number of his own "conceptions" and *à priori* reasonings which he can put before us. He seems to have, or to think he has, Scripture authority for what he holds. Why does he not produce it? I would really be glad to see and to consider what an able and accomplished writer like "J. B." can put forward in defence of "Aionial Purgatory" or against "Eternal Destruction" (in my sense of that expression), as a doctrine of Scripture.

It does not matter much, but I cannot help thinking that it is an abuse of language to say that "every individual of Adam's race, except those who die very

young, is exposed to raging passions, vices, and crimes," as well as to "agony, darkness, horror, and despair." It is happily not the case with many Christians that I know, and probably my range of acquaintance is as wide as "J. B.'s." How can he possibly know that what he states is true of any but the few he knows it of?

I suppose he acquiesces in what I put forward in my letter of April 9th as his view of God's treatment of mankind, "that while some of all kinds and classes are so saved and sanctified in the revealed way of salvation, as that, dying in the Lord, they are henceforth in joy and felicity for ever, others die in their sins, and are, before being saved at the length, subjected to what our Lord calls eternal punishment and St. Paul eternal destruction," *i.e.*, a penal existence that will last for at least an *aion* in a state that has been truthfully, even if figuratively, described as a lake or a furnace of fire, the process of their "education" being called by our Lord "destruction of both body and soul in Gehennah." Is this mode of training "intelligent beings for an endless existence" according to either Scripture or reason?

VINDEX.

April 30th, 1892.

A CHEAP AND GOOD HOLIDAY.

SIR,—The question, "Where shall I spend my holidays?" is one that will be exercising the minds of many of your readers very soon. The great requisites for a parson's holiday are quiet, varied scenery, pleasant company, and moderate expense. I thought that perhaps you would allow me, through your valuable columns, to inform my brother clergy of a way by which I have secured all these desirable requisites with the greatest possible benefit to my health. Living in a busy inland neighbourhood, I was anxious to get a whiff of the sea. A sea voyage had been suggested to me, but the crowded state of most excursion steamers, and the high charges made, rather frightened me. I was, however, advised to try a coasting voyage to Spain and Portugal in the "Hall's" line of steamers, and this advice I took. Anything more delightful I cannot easily imagine. For some thirty days we were coasting along the most interesting parts of Europe, enjoying glorious weather, pleasant company, and gaining a new lease of health. We spent several days at some well-known ports—Lisbon, Cadiz, Gibraltar, Malaga, etc. We had abundant opportunities for visiting Tangier, Granada, Seville, and other places in the very fairy land of Europe. During the whole time the ship was our hotel, and beyond our fare we had no need to spend a penny more than we wished. When I say that our total expense for travelling, food and all requisites, scarcely exceeded ten shillings per day, I think many of my brother clergy will be glad of the information, and encouraged to try this method of spending a holiday, which I have found so beneficial in my own case.

JOHN LIGHTFOOT.

Cross Stone Vicarage, Todmorden.

THE agitation against the Cambridge University jurisdiction has been somewhat subdued by the decision at Ipswich, which completely supported the action of the Proctor under existing circumstances, as well as by the practical difficulty of organising a new system which shall deal effectively with the old difficulty. A compromise has been proposed by some members of the Univerity which the townsmen would be well advised to accept; it is suggested that the proctorial powers on the streets should be retained, but that cases should be tried, not in the Vice-Chancellor's Court, but by the borough magistrates, or some similar tribunal. If the proctorial powers are retained, the chief point will have been secured so far as the maintenance of public order is concerned, and if there were a stipendiary magistrate in Cambridge, nothing could be better than the proposed arrangement. It may be doubted, however, whether the borough magistrates are a suitable body to adjudicate on such cases. The borough magistrates of Cambridge have never enforced compulsory education at all effectively; it is, of course, a somewhat unpopular proceeding to do so, and the members of each political party appear to prefer to leave the onus to men who belong to the other side. Whether this is the actual fact or not, it is commonly believed that political considerations do, as a matter of fact, influence the decisions of the bench. The proctorial cases would always give the opportunity of earning a little cheap popularity, of which some of the magistrates would be glad to avail themselves. In fact their decisions would carry very little weight. A college is practically bound to follow the decisions of a University court, and to impose the severe penalty of rustication on men who are found guilty of immorality; but convictions before the borough magistrates, resting perhaps on the evidence of policemen, would not, rightly or wrongly, have the same weight with them; and tutors would be inclined, so far as possible, to give their pupils the benefit of the doubt. There might be more severe penalties imposed in court, but not such heavy punishment as falls on offenders at present.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anderson, Rev. William Paley, B.A.; Prebendary of Holcombe in Wells Cathedral.

Badger, Rev. William Howard, B.A.; Rector of Greek, Tenbury.

Barton, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Cambridge; Rural Dean of Cambridge.

Baskett, Rev. Charles R., Curate of St. Mary's, Hull; Vicar of Birstwith, Ripley.

Bulstrode, Percy George, B.A.; Perpetual Curate of Broomfield, Somersetshire.

Cane, Rev. Alfred Granger, M.A.; Vicar of Great and Little Paxton, Hunts.

Coles, Rev. Reginald Edward, M.A.; Curate-in-Charge of the Windmill district in the parish of Bedminster, Bristol.

Colman, Rev. F. S., M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Earlsfield; Vicar of St. John's, Kingston Vale.

Connor, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of Alnwick and Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland; Surrogate.

Cornish, Canon S. E., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Redcliffe; Honorary Secretary of the Bristol Bishopric Fund.

Cowgill, Rev. Harry, M.A., Curate of St. Anne's, Derby; Vicar of Shireoaks, Worksop.

Cull, Rev. Ernest George. M.A.; Chaplain in the Royal Navy.

Domville, Rev. Charles Compton, M.A., Rector of Chickerel, Dorset; Rector of Nettleton, Wilts.

Donne, Rev. William, M.A.; Honorary Canon of St. Aelred, in Wakefield Cathedral; also Vicar of the Cathedral and Parish Church of All Saints', Wakefield.

Dowse, Rev. William, Curate of Monkstown, Dublin; Incumbent of St. Thomas's, Belfast.

Drake, Rev. C. B., M.A., Rector of Leverington, Wisbech; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire.
French, Rev. R. J., Incumbent of Beau Bassin, and Diocesan Secretary, S.P.G.; Chaplain to the Bishop of Mauritius.
Fyffe, Rev. E. T., M.A.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Duke of Wellington*.
Giles, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of Great and Little Paxton, St. Neots; Vicar of Little Bytham, Lincolnshire.
Gordon, Rev. H. D., M.A.; Prebendary of Wyndham in Rochester Cathedral.
Griffiths. Rev. John, Rector of Dalby, near Yorks; Vicar of Huttons Ambo, near Malton.
Hughes, Rev. Octavius Rutherford, B.A., Curate of St. Peter's, De Bouvoir-town; Chaplain to the Royal Navy.
Hunter, Rev. H. C. F.; Chaplain to the *Boscawen*.
Lambarde, Rev. C. J., Vicar of Southill; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Kent.
Langdon, Rev. C. A. C., Curate of Stoke-next-Guildford; Vicar of Laughton, Hawkhurst, Sussex.
Longrigg, Rev J. W., M.A.; Chaplain to the *Caledonia*.
Matthews, Rev. Frederick J., M.A.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to Chatham Dockyard and Hospital.
Menzies, Rev. Alfred Sydney, B.A.; Vicar of Burley-on-the-Hill, Oakham.
Moor, Rev. Horatio Charles, B.A., Curate of St. George's, Worthing; Vicar of Scropton-cum-Foston, Derbyshire.
Norman, Rev. William Haswell, M.A.; Permission to Officiate in the Dioceses of Ely and Norwich.
Percival, Rev. Arthur; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Peterborough.
Pitman, Rev. John H., M.A.; Chaplain of Plymouth Hospital.
Rees, Rev. Samuel George, M.A.; Rector of Goadby Marwood, Melton Mowbray.
Rice, Rev. A. C. H., M.A.; Chaplain to the *Northampton*.
Richards, Rev. David, B.A.; Chaplain in the Royal Navy.
Royse, Rev. W. H. H.; Chaplain to the *Himalaya*.
Sandys, Rev. Samuel, M.A., lately Curate of St. Matthew's, Campfield; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Scott, Rev. Edward John, B.A., late Senior Curate of Birchfield, Birmingham; Curate-in-Charge of Dagnall, Bucks.
Sharrock, Rev. W. R., M.A., Vicar of Great Driffield; Rural Dean of Harthill.
Sherlock, Rev. Henry, B.A., Vicar of Coldham, and Hon. Assistant-Inspector of Schools, Diocese of Ely; Organising Secretary for Diocesan Inspection, County of Cambridge and Isle of Ely.
Sumner, Rev. Francis Henry, M.A., Vicar of Hurstbourne-Tarrant; Vicar of All Saints', Alton.
Sykes, Rev. Daniel M., Curate of St. Mark's, Heyside, Oldham; Vicar of North Leverton-with-Apesthorpe, Notts.
Trench, Rev. Herbert Francis Chenevix, M.A., Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist's, Tue Brook, near Liverpool; Vicar of Monmouth.
Whittam, Rev. W. G., M.A., Assistant-Master of Eastbourne College; Head-Master of Ryde College, Isle of Wight.
Whymper, Rev. Alfred, Perpetual Curate of St. James's, Nottingham; Vicar of St. Paul's, Nottingham.
Woodhouse, Rev. Thomas Edward; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Peterborough.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Evans, Rev. William Howell, M.A., Vicar of Rhyl, and Rural Dean of St. Asaph, at Rhyl Vicarage, on the 26th ult., aged 57.
Hopkinson, Rev. E. Francis, late Rector of Ilchester, at San Jacinto, California, on the 8th ult., aged 46.
Lindsay, Rev. Henry, M.A., Honorary Canon of Peterborough, twenty-nine years Rector of Kettering, at the Rectory, on the 29th ult., aged 68.
Lonsdale, Rev. James Gylby, formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, at 6, Queen's-parade, Bath, on the 25th ult., aged 75.
Mules, Rev. Philip, Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Rutland, at Belvoir Castle, on the 26th ult., aged 79.
Stansbury, Rev. John Adolphus, one of the Classical Masters of Oundle School, and Curate-in-Charge of Nassington, Northamptonshire, at Benefield, near Oundle, on the 26th ult., aged 58.
Wood, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Easebourne, Midhurst, at the Vicarage, on the 25rd ult., aged 68.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time my vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitated for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for more than an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses, Mr. Harness's Electropathic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restoring appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE POWER OF THE RESURRECTION.

By the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

Sermon Preached in Gloucester Cathedral on Easter Sunday Morning.

"If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."—1 Thess. iv. 14.

I AM thankful, my dear brethren, again to be permitted to address you on the morning of this most holy and most happy day. Last year the subject of my sermon was the power of the Lord's Resurrection—the power, as working now—perhaps year by year more mightily than ever, not only on all the realms of conscious or unconcious matter around us, but in the bodies, souls, and spirits of men. The energy of this power, and some of its forms of manifestation, was the subject of our thoughts on the morning of our last Easter Day. And we may profitably continue the subject under a particular aspect, which the past and present year seem more especially to bring home to us. The latter portion of the year that has gone by, and the greater part of the three months of the present year that have now passed away, have been marked by great sorrows to countless households in this country. It has pleased God to chasten us by the presence of an insidious disease which has borne away from us, often with startling suddenness, not only the weak and the aged, but those in average health and strength whom some passing imprudence had placed under its baneful influence. Well-nigh every household has felt the shadow, in some form or other, of the chastening hand, and it is only recently that we have been mourning with our beloved Sovereign and her Royal house over the removal from us of the young and hopeful heir to the throne of this ancient kingdom.

Even, then, on this most blessed and most joyful day there are numbers who may be conscious of a heart-inability to rejoice as the spirit tells us we ought to rejoice on a day such as this; numbers who may be longing for some message of consolation, some wafted comfort from that restful world beyond the grave—that blessed, unseen realm which the dear Lord who rose on this day did once vouchsafe to irradiate with His personal presence.

What then can be better for us all, on this Easter Day, than to carry out the thought of our last Easter Day—the power of the Lord's Resurrection—under that particular aspect which seems now most to come home to us—its power to bring sunshine to us amid our sorrows; its power to minister, not only consolation, but rejoicing. One word, however, of necessary warning before we begin. Our ability to receive consolation depends entirely upon our faith. The text on which we are about to meditate interposes its monitory "if" before it permits us to dwell upon its consolatory revelation: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them which are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." Unless there be a firm and heart-whole belief in the fact of the Resurrection, none of the comfort which this most quickening text bears with it can ever flow into the soul. Nay more, we may say that the inability to be comforted, the unresigned state of soul that cannot wipe away its tears of bitterness, will ever be found a certain sign that true faith in the fact of the Lord's Resurrection has not yet been vouchsafed to the soul. Of this there have been lately very sad illustrations. In many of the public comments that were made on the death of the young Prince to whom I have alluded, there was a distinct pagan element in thought, epithet, and expression that revealed the utterly imperfect recognition of the truth and reality of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ which, I fear, is now very plainly to be traced in the current literature of the day. The Lord's Resurrection is not exactly denied, except by the professed opponents of Christianity, but it is left as something which lies outside the sphere of historical investigation, and can never be soberly regarded as ministering any real consolation on the bitterness of human sorrows and bereavement. In a word, the power of the Resurrection in its holiest application to the individual soul is deemed to be nothing more than an innocent illusion; and a distinct statement, such as that which the Apostle makes in the text, is put aside as belonging only to the poetry of religion. Against such cheerless views we need not here pause either to reason or to protest. The inward testimony of the soul is in itself a sufficient answer to all these bleak doubts as to the consolations that are ministered to us by the Lord's Resurrection, or the application of such a text as that which I have chosen to our hopes of future reunions. If Pagans like Cicero, in calm and philosophical treatises, could break out into utterances of longing for the glorious day when they might enter into the blessed council and company of the souls of the great and the good who had left this earth—if Pagans could so speak, can we, who have the sure and certain hope which this day ministers hesitate, for one moment in drawing from such a text as the present all the consolation, the boundless consolation, that it bears to us when in our bereavements the sad question is pressing itself on the soul, will there

ever be a true union again? This text, remember, was designedly written to console, and especially in reference to such a question as that which we are now preparing to consider. We know plainly from the epistle that the loving heart of the Christian of Thessalonica was torn by sad doubts as to future reunion with those near and dear to him who had not been spared to see what he was expecting almost daily to see—the return of his long-looked-for Lord. Would not, he argued, the very circumstances of the case preclude future union? Could the brethren who had been called away before the Advent have that share in its blessings and glories which would be the holy lot of those who would, with their own eyes, behold their Lord when the descending clouds might bear Him down to them. And if they had not that share, then would not the possibility of reunion be done away with finally and for ever? These were the doubts which the text and the glorious verses which follow it were intended to dispel. And the doubts and questionings of the present day are in substance the same. These dear ones, it is often said, that have gone, shall we ever be united to them again? In the many mansions of the Father's House can we ever hope certainly to find them? When we sit—if we are so blest as to sit—at the great marriage supper of the Lamb, will they be by our side? And if they are not, will not—unless our holiest earthly affections are illusory—heaven itself seem to be lacking in its blessedness? Such thoughts will sometimes force themselves upon us. They are, it may be admitted, faithless thoughts. But still thoughts they are, so far natural that God has vouchsafed by direct utterances in His holy Word to calm them, and to minister to the poor heart's anxious questions the complete and consolatory answer, "Those whom the Lord Jesus has laid to sleep, God will bring with Jesus when He comes to this earth again." Then, whether before we know not, then, at any rate, reunion will be vouchsafed in its fullest and most blessed form; all will be united, one with another, because united for ever in Him.

This is the solemn and deliberate answer of Scripture.

Like all the answers of Scripture on these anxious and ultimate questions, it does not even hint any reply to the countless forms of inquiry which longing and perplexed hearts will, to the very end of time, put forward on these profound subjects. Many a heart of those who now are hearing me may perhaps be saying within, "And is reunion to be so long deferred? Are we not to behold our dear ones again until the Lord's Coming—until that presumably distant day?" To such questions we can return no certain answer. All that is essential for us to know is plainly revealed to us in our present text, and to this, and to this only, shall we be wise to confine our present meditations. The text discloses to us two blessed and consolatory truths, each containing in regard of those that die in Christ the holiest and deepest consolation. First, that those who have loved the Lord, and have departed hence in His faith and fear, pass into a union with Him that becomes ever closer and closer, and in special cases may even be crowned with that first Resurrection of which, in one well-known passage in the last book of Holy Scripture, there is such precise and definite mention. To those who have loved the Lord on earth and have loved Him to the last, this text plainly tells us we may confidently believe there will be this closer union,—the degree of closeness depending on the depth and reality of the love . . . . And this, let it be remembered, is no isolated text; this is by no means the only passage in which we have the same consolatory truth, that by the Lord's Resurrection death has verily been swallowed up in victory, and is to the believer no longer the curse, but the blessed mode of entry into a truer union with his Lord. When for example St. Paul, in the well-known passage in his Epistle to the Philippians, describes his strait between his desire to remain on earth for the sake of the souls of his converts, and his desire to leave it and to be with Christ, he uses the language of a conviction and a certitude which may fully justify us in regarding the passage as conveying an unqualified though indirect assurance that the faithful departed are then in far closer union with Christ than they were while in the tabernacle of the flesh. Nay more, our inmost souls tell us that it must be so. There cannot be really one earnest man or woman in this present congregation who has not often, in higher moments, longed for a union with our Lord and Saviour more true and more quickening than any union which this world, with its sorrows, its cares, its temptations, has ever permitted us to realise. Not only the distractions and anxieties of life, but its claims and its duties, often make us feel, like poor Martha, that we are verily so cumbered with much serving that to sit at the Lord's feet, in any abiding sense, the greater part of us must wait for the other side of the grave. "We that are in this tabernacle," to use an Apostle's words, "do groan, being burdened"; and this very feeling, and the expression of it, are but the dim anticipations of that resting with the Lord which, we seem to be persuaded, Paradise alone can bring to us.

"O Paradise, O Paradise,
'Tis weary waiting here;
We long to be where Jesus is,
To feel, to see Him near."

The testimony of the soul is at one with the testimony of Scripture.

This is the first truth which the text reveals; but the deeper heart-question still remains. Can there be, will there be, reunion hereafter with those we have loved here on earth? Yea verily, who can doubt it, for those that die in Christ. If the text

tells us that to the faithful death bears with it a closer union with Christ, and that to die is gain, it assuredly also tells us that there will be a true, real, and blessed reunion hereafter with all that we have loved on earth, and who have died in the faith of the Lord. When Christ returns, God Himself—such are the plain words of the text—will bring with the Redeemer, all in one blessed and united company, the redeemed; and, as another passage still more precisely declares, will Himself—Himself, the God of the spirits of all flesh—wipe away every tear in the limitless joy of that last and indissoluble reunion.

And this, remember, is no truth which merely rests upon isolated or precarious texts to which our mere feelings and sympathies have assigned their interpretation. Our present text, as we have already seen, is a portion of a passage deliberately intended to reassure and to console, and especially in reference to the future union of the faithful living and the faithful dead. Nay more, it is but the expression of the consequences, here and hereafter, that flow from our union with a risen and an ever-living Lord. To this end, says the Apostle, Christ died and lived again that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living. If He be Lord of both, then in union with Him is the certitude of the communion of all that love Him, whether here or in Paradise or in the endless ages of His everlasting reign. The communion at present is imperfect—though, let me say, in countless cases and instances, much less imperfect than is commonly supposed. Imperfect, however, it is, and we feel and we know it to be so; nay, we often betray it by anxious questions which, if we had a true conception of what is really meant by the union of the faithful in Christ, and their consequent union with one another, could never cause disquietude in the soul of the true believer. How often is the question, whenever we meditate on the world beyond the grave, anxiously put forward—"Shall we recognise one another hereafter?" "Will the bond of family love ensure that recognition?" "Or will all things have become so changed in the passage through death that loved and holy faces that have been to us here below like the lights of the morning, will never more be so realised hereafter?" Such questions could never rise up in the soul, if all that is involved in union with Christ had, in any adequate degree, been experienced and realised. In Him everything that ministers to the fulness of holy joy will be vouchsafed to us, every pure sympathy will be responded to, every longing of holy love will be tenderly satisfied. If we are truly His, that communion of saints which, in the Apostle's Creed, we profess as one of the fundamental articles of our Faith, will attain its fullest perfection and development. But could communion be perfect if souls that had been united by the closest bond here on earth were to lose all consciousness of that bond in the world beyond, and all that constituted personality were to be forgotten or obliterated? No, my dear friends, though it be right for us to say with the Apostle, "that it is not yet made manifest what we shall be," and that many things connected with personal identity here may, by the very assumption of the glorified body, become modified hereafter, still of this we may feel the most abiding assurance that whatever has constituted the truest communion of souls on this side the grave will continue when at last all are united, and continue not only unimpaired but enhanced. Yea verily, if personal recognition and knowledge be an inseparable element of the truest communion here on earth so must it be for ever. If God, who is love, brings again all who have been laid to sleep in Jesus, will He withhold from them that knowledge and recognition without which personal love could never be complete and perfected?

Whether this reasoning may be applied to what St. Paul speaks of as the "unclothed" state, and whether mutual recognition may exist in the period prior to the Resurrection, we know not. The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus or the scene at the Transfiguration may give us ground for hoping that it may be so; but in this, as in many other questions connected with the doctrine of the Last Things, we have no clear revelation like that on which now we are meditating. And when Scripture is silent, speculation is often not only unprofitable but harmful. There is now a tendency, becoming, year by year, more pronounced, to seek to know what Scripture, so far as we can infer from its silence, has designedly concealed from us. Dangerous illusions are secretly cherished, and even practices resorted to which every sober-minded Christian must reprobate and condemn as worse than superstitious, and as opening, it may be, avenues to temptations which in the end may pervert all true and salutary faith.

Even in modern religious books written by really devout persons there is often much that goes beyond that serious reserve which we ever find in Scripture in reference to the precise state of the departed. There are in Scripture—thank God for it—clear and distinct outlines, but nothing more. They are confessedly no more than outlines, yet what consolation they bear with them; what real, and yet at the same time what tender and most persuasive warning. How plainly our text tells us that to all who are in Christ there will be unspeakably blessed reunions, meetings with all whom we have loved here on earth and who have been laid to sleep by Jesus; meetings, precisely when, we know not—whether in the many mansions of the Father's House, or when the palm-bearing multitude will stand around the Lord, we know not—but meetings round which all the peace and joy of eternity will be wreathed for evermore. This, and no less than this, the few but vital words of our text most surely disclose to us. Yet, at the same

time, what unspeakably solemn warning they bear with them and bring home to our hearts, even while they comfort and quicken! Is it not those laid to sleep by Jesus, His beloved to whom He has made death as a gentle sleep? Is it not these only of whom the text is speaking. And if we be not living in Christ and humbly and trustfully hoping thus ourselves to be laid to sleep when life's work is over, what ground have we for expecting these holy meetings and reunions hereafter?

When thus we consider the text we see how all does, and must, depend on union with Christ here. And what a call it is to us to live all a little nearer to Christ! How we seem to hear in these words a call to us from loved ones who have departed in the faith of Christ, so to live here that we may live with them for ever hereafter, to fight the good fight as they were permitted to fight it, and with them to receive the heavenly reward and the unfading crown.

These are true home calls. God grant that on this blessed day, when the Church militant is, as it were, united more closely with the Church triumphant, we may hear these calls in soul and spirit, and be drawn by them closer to Him in whom alone future reunion can be realised—our risen, glorified, and returning Lord.

CREATION AND SCIENCE.

By the Rev. Prebendary BASSETT, M.A., Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Dulverton.

Sermon Preached in Wells Cathedral on Sunday, April 10th, 1892.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."—Gen. i. 1.

THE beginning of everything—of anything—how important, yet how mysterious! How far beyond the reach of test, probation and knowledge!

In rearing an edifice, what a grave matter in the eyes of a "wise master-builder" is the foundation, on which all the superstructure is to rest, both as to material and position, yet in after years these things that exercised the brain of the architect with so much anxiety, are buried deep down out of sight and banished from the observation of a heedless posterity.

With ourselves, individually, it has been said, and I think with truth, that the greater part of our history is written before we are born; for how much in our constitution, both mental and physical, depends upon our ancestral antecedents, the virtues or vices of our parents, their habits, their condition of body and mind, their frames, and even their fancies. Yet the first springs of our existence are sealed up in the innermost recesses of secrecy, they leave no impression on the tablets of the memory; self-consciousness is silent; all we know or can know, and this all is but a fraction—and that fraction deals only with a few facts that are but external and material—comes from the knowledge and the testimony of others. Such thoughts lead us to the consideration of subjects still more secret and more sublime.

This chapter purports to give an account of the origin of this earth on which we dwell, and of the universe in which it floats like an atom upon the bosom of an ocean that has no shore. What should we know, what could we know about the beginning of the world without this "Book of Origins"? It may be replied, From geology. Can we not with the hand of this science draw back the veil that is folded over the secrets of the structure of our planet, and trace the stages by which layer was spread upon layer till the fabric was finished? Doubtless geology has accomplished marvels in our days. No special attention seems to have been directed to this subject till the present century, and its progress has been marked with a rapidity of advance that is only equalled in wonder by the ingenuity displayed by the students of the science. Nevertheless, we must remember that this is not an exact science; it does not depend like astronomy for its proofs upon calculations and mathematical demonstrations which are infallible, but upon theories based upon observation, which may turn out to be a true concept of facts, or may be supplanted by rival theories which subsequently commend themselves as more plausible or probable. But after all legitimate deduction for friction of possible errors has been made, the solid facts that have a right to the claim of incontrovertible discoveries are many and marvellous.

Here we are upon the surface of a globe. What is under our feet? Some few philosophers hold that the globe is solid, more or less, throughout its mass; but by far the greater number tell us that the internal contents of our planet are fire and molten matter, which are enclosed in a crust or envelope, on the surface of which we live, and move, and have our being. This crust is computed, not known, to be on an average ten to fifteen miles thick, and the deepest mine is calculated to be not more than half a mile in depth; neither would it be possible for man to breathe and live at any very great distance below the surface on account not only of the heat that increases with the depth, but also on account of the condition of the air, which grows more dense the deeper we go down. How then can we tell what is beyond the reach of our observation?

Among other aids, the following holds a leading place. There are forces both of fire and water, more especially the former, which have been in remote ages, and are sometimes in our own, at work, which by upheaving and breaking through the

crust have thrown up the layers that were the deepest, and so by inverting the order of their original deposit have placed the first last and the last first. But in this catastrophe of rupture and revolution, what changes, chemical and electrical, as well as general and local, must there have been, so that the record of the rocks, though conveying the data of indisputable truth, must yet depend for its solution largely upon the acumen and accuracy of the interpreter of the legend.

Here it is that the Bible steps in with its history of the architecture of the universe in general, and our earth in particular, and of the origin of that mysterious quality which we call life.

Other accounts have come down through the traditions of other nations in which two main features claim our notice: the one is, that they all present symptoms of a closely allied relationship and of a common ultimate parentage, coloured and varied, distinguished and distorted by the characteristics, both religious and national, of the races through which they have found their way; and the other is, that when placed side by side with the Mosaic narrative, the puerile and paltry, the incredible and the impossible additions, which have adhered to what we believe to have been the primitive revelation, render all rivalry in the way of competition for acceptance at once ludicrous and absurd. The biblical account stands alone in its "perfect beauty," alike worthy of God to reveal and of man to receive and believe.

Before entering upon some of the subjects that call for notice in this chapter, I may remark that there are many who say that the clergy should not bring before the people committed to their charge subjects which have not only furnished a field of controversy, but have also been taken so much advantage of by the unbeliever and misbeliever that it is more than doubtful whether edification will result, and not rather perplexity and doubt. Far better, say they, to keep simply to the doctrines and duties of the Gospel, which all can understand and by which all can be profited. This is quite true, and the course would be a far more pleasant one to pursue, but, alas! the spirit of the times will not suffer us to abide by our own choice. The daily newspapers and the so-called religious periodicals and magazines are crowded with articles on religious topics to suit all classes and conditions of men and various stages of intellectual development. Such publications deal with questions of controversy, the veracity and authority of Scripture, the authorship and the dates of the books, and the so-called antagonism between Scripture and science, so that the faithful teacher feels constrained to come forward and defend the foundations of the faith at any risk, and prove to his hearers that the truth is on the side of God and not of man; and it is to be remembered that there is such a charge current in our days that preachers may be more afraid of the subject than of their congregations. It is the consideration that the chief daily paper of our country has during the past winter opened its pages to a discussion of the relations between Scripture and science before the whole world that at once prompted my choice of this subject, and must plead my apology for so doing on the present occasion in the mother church of the diocese.

In the first place there are several words which call for notice and explanation in this chapter. Foremost stands the word *God*, which here occurs for the first time on the sacred page. What God? Who is He? What answer can those critics give to this question, who would post-date this portion of Genesis to a period after the Babylonish captivity! What God? There were, long before that date, among the nations, those called "gods many and lords many;" but who is this one God? The only answer that can be given is, in consideration that the books of the Bible stand in some proper order and sequence, the God that made the heavens and the earth, the God of Adam and of Noah, of Abraham and Moses, of Samuel and David, and of the prophets, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the God who so loved the world that He gave His only Begotten Son that we might be saved through Him, the God who is and will be all in all for ever.* And here it must be enforced that the histories of other nations and their traditions, however interwoven with myth and fable, and their religions, though presented under the forms of deified forces of nature, all bear evidence of one really Supreme Ruler, who is God of gods and Lord of lords. Thus witness is borne to the fact that polytheism was a corruption of monotheism, and not as some vainly teach, that man first worshipped the gods many till a wiser race arose that recognised the unity of the Divine Majesty.

The next word is "In the beginning" or rather absolutely "In beginning." In the beginning not with reference to God, but to His work. In a point in eternity the activities of Deity were put forth and the formation of matter was commenced.

"God created." To create properly means to beget. The original Hebrew word is of like force. The lesson conveyed is twofold: firstly, matter is not eternal, but had an origin and a beginning; and, secondly, the source from which all things are derived was not an inferior God, or a council of semi-divine æons or underlings of Deity, but the one God, the *Father* Almighty.

Another prominent word in this chapter is *Day*. There are six days in which God worked, and a

* The original Hebrew word *Elohim*, which is closely allied to other ancient Semitic ones, comprehends the possession and source of all powers. Our own English word God is traceable through remote Oriental channels to an Egyptian origin, and means existence or spirit. Thus viewed it resembles the great memorial name Jehovah the self-existing, and a new light falls on the Saviour's words, "God is Spirit."—John iv. 24.

seventh on which He rests. In Hebrew, as with ourselves, this word is used in a special and in a general sense. It may mean an exact solar day consisting of twenty-four hours, and it may mean a long and indefinite space of time. The latter is clearly intended here, for it must be noted that the sun was not "made" till the fourth day, and therefore the three previous days could not have been caused by the sun and by the earth's revolution on its axis, by which first one portion and then another is turned toward the sun, producing the alternations of day and night; and, further, these days are specified as beginning with an evening and ending with a morning, thus the space intervening would be half a day, and that the nocturnal half. Neither must we confound these days with the mode of computing the Jewish day, for that began with the evening and ended with the following evening, not with the next morning. These days, therefore, are days of the calendar of heaven rather than of the calendar of earth, reckoned by the arithmetic of Deity and not of man, and yet they furnish an example for man to imitate, for as God engaged for six vast ages in creative energy and rests the seventh age, the end of which is not yet come; so according to the Commandment is man to labour his six little days and rest the seventh by the graduated scale that reflects in the temporal the eternal, and in the human the Divine.*

This portion of Holy Writ being so important as the basis on which all the revelation that follows is built, we need not wonder that the opponents have concentrated their attack on this stronghold. Search has been made in every possible direction to discover difficulties and disagreements historical, verbal, and, above all, scientific. But while the work of destruction has engrossed all thoughts, there has been a most unfair ignoring of the many features in the narrative which, so far from coming into collision with other sources of information, exhibit a surprising amount of coincidence and harmony. A true critic is noted for his strict impartiality, and true criticism is an unbiassed examination into facts without prejudice or partisanship. In the question before us it is often alleged, and that with the coolest confidence, that the results of scientific investigation have utterly disproved the accuracy of this record of creation, and if we will persist in clinging to this account as the foundation of our faith, we must evaporate its statements into myth, or legend, or allegory, or parable, or vision, or dream, and even then the task of reconciling the page of Scripture with the discoveries of modern science will be more conspicuous for its ingenuity than for its accuracy. But is this charge really true? Is it not at all events our duty to subject the indictment to examination by placing side by side the demands and admissions of science and the statements which are found in Scripture.

Let us here make an emphatic declaration that we do not for a moment claim that the Bible is to be regarded as a text-book of natural science, but we do maintain that a plain categorical statement made on its pages should be found to be true.

Now, science tells us that the actual beginning of the formation of matter is not yet discovered and is perhaps undiscoverable, but at a very early stage of its existence it was in a condition of chaos or confusion. What says the Scripture? "The earth was without form and void"—was disorder and emptiness. Where is the collision between the two records? Science tells us that at a very remote period light, possibly of an electric or auroral nature, permeated space. What says the Scripture? "God said, Let there be light, and there was light"; and this was on the first day. Where is the disagreement between the two witnesses? Science says the vegetable matter preceded animal existence. Scripture says, "Let the earth bring forth grass and herbs and fruitful trees;" and this came to pass on the third day, whereas animal life was not in existence till the fifth day, where is the discord? Science says that life was first formed beneath the waters. What saith the Scripture? "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life." Where is the contradiction? Science says that beasts arose after these, and that man was the last of all to become a living soul. And does not the Word witness the same; and where, may we ask, is the discrepancy and the irreconcilable antagonism? This question has been urged, and the answer demanded. Two special replies only appear to have been made. Scripture places the appearance of birds, it is asserted, before reptiles, whereas according to the testimony of the *strata* of the earth, reptiles preceded birds. Now, is this so? The features of the case seem to utter a caution at least to the hasty disputant. There are two words in this account rendered in our Bibles, "moving creature" and "creeping thing.' These words are perfectly distinct in the original as in our own tongue. We cannot get from them any meaning more definite than "swarmers" and "crawlers." Words totally distinct show that there must be a difference between the classes of the creatures intended, and yet it is needless to add that both words are of very wide comprehension, embracing creatures of various orders and families, so that any very definite conclusion is doubtful. Further, the word rendered "fowl" in Genesis is only a winged creature, and need not be a bird only, as we know birds; it may imply reptiles, of which some of the largest are found to have had wings in the earliest periods of their existence, though afterwards this appendage was withdrawn. A more

* These creation-days appear again in Ps. cxxxix. 16 (in the original) in connection with the period of mother-earth's gestation of humanity; and in Prov. viii. 30; and the phrase 'Evening-morning" is found in Dan. viii. 14, where it defines the commencement and close of a period of 2,300, whatever unit may be supplied to the number denoted.

feeble answer, therefore, to the challenge, based upon so trifling a matter, involving many indefinite points, itself falling so far short of proof, and even incurring defeat, it is difficult to conceive, especially in the presence of so many great and startling coincidences of agreement. The other reply opens a far wider question by assuming that a theory is a fact, that evolution is a real and unquestioned discovery. If this is accepted, special acts of creation, it is urged, must be abandoned, as all things, material substances and mental powers alike, are ultimately derived from the lowest forms of life. But this begs the whole question. There may be some difficulties which seem to be removed in part by the theory, but to a naturalist who gathers his knowledge from personal observation of nature and not from books and theories of others, who has regard to the laws which certainly now govern the animal world, the theory is perfectly unproved and untenable, because it leaves out so many facts which indisputably exist, and fails to explain the racial peculiarities which follow fixed laws, and lastly introduces a confusion of blood against which all nature revolts, and for which no examples in nature, when left to itself, can be produced. We conclude therefore that although the Bible was not given us as a text-book of natural philosophy, yet so far from this chapter being negatived by the recently acquired results of science, we are confident to affirm that in its bold outline it has largely anticipated those discoveries, and maintains its ground as a witness to the truth, though we believe these coincidences to be undesigned.

There are two thoughts that I would presume to press on your attention before leaving this part of our subject. Even the most bigoted opponent must confess that there are many points of agreement (to say no more) between the statements of this chapter and the present results of scientific inquiry. Where and whence did the writer obtain his information? We have, as already observed, other traditions which have come down through the channel of other ancient nations besides the Hebrews; they bear, as we have said, a certain likeness to our record, but in the very places where the critic demands a scientific or an accurate statement, they all utterly fail, and where our account is conspicuous for its sublime majesty of thought and expression, they dwindle away into irrational and ludicrous fancies. We repeat, therefore, where did our author obtain his information? It could not come from the traditions of other nations, for we have these, and see at once the impossibility of such a parentage. Further, post-date the Pentateuch to whatever period the prejudices of scepticism demand, let this chapter, for argument's sake, be as recent as 444 B.C., as some critics endeavour to persuade themselves and their pupils, or with the orthodox hold the Mosaic authorship, or with the wavering middle party fix any date between the two, what nation, what school of philosophy, what intellectual giant was there on the face of the earth during those one thousand years that had the necessary knowledge derived through the processes of science to pen these pages? The scientific knowledge of the present day, be it remembered, is the peculiar property of the nineteenth century. No one in the world could have written so truthful a sketch (for it is only a sketch) of the successive steps of creation or development until the present day. Historical criticism boasts of great victories, historical criticism, to be worthy of its name and pretensions, is bound to acount for this fact and to solve this problem. Amid the ignorance and superstitions of the ages, how did this, the greatest miracle arise, that a man, whoever he was, and at whatever period he lived before the zenith of the Persian domination over Israel, should be able to know and write a categorical statement concerning the origin of all things, which the acutest critics of our day, armed with the elaborate equipments of science and energised with a determination to disprove the proposition, can only attack, and that not successfully, in one or two small and uncertain details, and fall back upon a theory which is still struggling for a doubtful acceptance? Is the Word of God to fall before a foe like this? Surely, unless we discard Revelation altogether and deny the possibility of information being given from the Creator to the creature, all must confess with the convinced adversaries of old, "This is the finger of God."

The other point I would press is this. What writer calling to his aid any account of scientific knowledge current in his time and nation, or resting on his own observation, could have made such a preposterous statement that light was created on the first day, but the sun not till the fourth day? Every possible means of information either from his own reasonings or from the evidence of his senses, or from the teaching of his fellows, must have identified the sun with light, and made their appearance on the scene to have been one in time and one in place. No one could have given to the world a statement so apparently impossible, and exposed himself to ridicule or thrown such an obstacle in the way of the faith of his own and after generations. Surely he must have had a reason for stating so incredible a proposition. Yet, strange to say, in the latter days of the world, so far from being proved scientifically false, as to all experience it seems to be, it has for some considerable time been regarded as a fact; and stranger still, the names of the originators of the theory, Kant and Laplace, will show that they had no friendly feelings towards Revelation. The theory is that the solar system was once one revolving nebulous mass, and by centrifugal forces volumes were thrown off its circumference which consolidated into planets. In its own proper turn our earth thus parted company

with the central globe; after that the planet we call Venus; and after that, Mercury took his departure from the sun, and left him, as we now know him, the centre of attraction and the minister of light to the daughter worlds that revolve around him. Thus, light was before sunlight, and the earth was separated from the sun before the sun settled down to his present proportions.

But we repeat, how could any one in earth's early days have known this, and how could any one have made such a statement without authority, and what could that authority be on which he evidently rested as infallible, and which the long series of the centuries has proved to be true? The sceptic is bound to answer this.

This chapter details six successive changes which have passed over this world. These may be called historical, as they are narratives of facts that took place in the past. The closing chapters of the Apocalypse, which are parallel and corresponding with the opening of Genesis, disclose a page of future history which is commonly called prophecy. In the vision granted to the seer, another change, a seventh—the mystic number of the completion of Divine manifestations—was seen to pass over this planet. A baptism of fire will be the initiatory sacrament of the next dispensation, and out of the ruin of the old there will be a resurrection of new heavens and new earth; and just as each of the former six creations was an advance upon its predecessor, so shall the last climacteric change be a betterment of all that now is, of earth and its surroundings, its peoples, its occupants, its produce, its loveliness, and its light, a passing from death unto life, a change from glory to glory.

In the old creation and under Adam the first man fell, and a myriad of miseries and woes followed as the dark retinue of sin. Over the new creation Adam the second shall reign supreme, and His redeemed shall see His face and be glad. On His realm no Satan serpent shall trespass, no sin creep inside His precincts, no temptation lure away from allegiance to the Lord. The "called and chosen and faithful" are gathered in, saved and secured for ever, and the Great Creator, the God and Father of all, will gaze upon the regenerated work of His hands and pronounce the primæval blessing never to be cancelled or withdrawn, "Behold it is very good." Now, we must remind you that if you admit the history to be true, you must also admit the prophecy to be true, as they rest on the same authority, the Word of God. Neither must we forget the practical lesson to be derived from the comparison of these Scriptures. We ourselves belong by nature to Adam the first and the fallen. By grace we are made members of Christ the second Adam. But this transference from the one family to the other, to be valid for our salvation, must be a conscious experience and a life-long exercise of faith, and hope, and love. We must rely on the sacrifice of the Lamb of God as the propitiation for our sins, we must be vested in the robe of His righteousness, and sanctified and sealed by His Holy Spirit. Thus being made partakers of a divine nature we must sunder the ties that bind us, the bands of those sins which by our fall and our frailty we have committed. We must mortify the deeds of the body, crucify the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts and abolish the whole body of sin, if when old things shall have passed away we are to find our inheritance in the new heavens and new earth, in the many mansions of our Father's house.

PROFESSOR SAYCE is proposing to give two public lectures at Oxford on the 1st and 2nd of June. The first of them is to be on Babylonia, Egypt, and Palestine in the age of the Exodus; the second, on the Romance of Cuneiform Discovery. The second title sounds a little ambiguous. Has the Professor been converted, and does he intend to declare that cuneiform discovery is a romance? Or does he propose to show how romantic is the story which the cuneiform discoveries disclose, or, again, what a romance there was in the way in which the discoveries were made?

THE *Church Union Gazette* expresses regret at losing the valuable services of the Rev. C. Gordon Browne as assistant secretary of the E.C.U. "These services have always been so heartily rendered, and have contributed so much to the better organisation of the Union, and the development of its work and strength, that his departure from the office to undertake the duties of parish priest at Lympstone, in Devon, cannot but be felt as a great loss. It is, however, with great satisfaction that we are able to announce that one who has long been well known at the office as an able organiser, lecturer, and preacher, and who has done good service on the Press Committee—the Rev. W. F. Cobb, B.D., assistant-priest at St. Luke's, Kentish-town, N.W.—has been offered the vacant post by the President and Council, and has consented to take it from June 1st, the day of Mr. Browne's departure."

FUNERAL REFORM ASSOCIATION. — The fifth monthly meeting of the Funeral Reform Association was held last week at the Church House, Westminster. Among those present were the Archdeacon of London (in the chair), the Hon. D. Fortescue, Gen. Lowry, the Rev. F. B. Johnston, the Rev. R. B. Ramsford, Dr. W. T. Greene, Dr. Septimus Gibbon, Dr. W. Squire, Mr. Vigers, Mrs. Leigh Hunt Wallis, and Miss Bayley. The Archdeacon said that London and other great towns needed more cemeteries within convenient reach, and each cemetery should be conducted as a natural underground purifier, where the dead are dissolved by the action of the earth and air, instead of being preserved. The extra cost of more numerous spaces required by such sanitary burial could be met by the abandonment of prevalent funeral extravagances. A natural earthen grave, where the body rests undisturbed until earth and air have set it free, showed, he urged, more respect than an imperishable coffin.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1892.

DEEMING.

IN a short time Deeming will be dead. The slow forms of justice may interpose delay, but it cannot be long before we are rid of this wholesale criminal. We wish we could as soon be rid of the circumstances and conditions which made him possible. Deeming's career is a stinging comment upon our social system. Here we are, in 1892, and a man is actually able to spend a lifetime in uninterrupted warfare, of the most determined kind, against society, and hardly meets a check or obstacle. Had he lived in Dahomey he could hardly have done much more. And yet he was not a clever criminal—rather a stupid one; a great talker, a gross liar, a confirmed boaster, a fellow who ought to have deceived nobody, and would not have deceived anybody who did not wish to be deceived.

And yet this brutal dullard has preyed successfully upon us for some score or more of years. We shall never know the full catalogue of his crimes. The five known murders may perhaps be doubled or trebled and still be wide of the mark, while there can hardly be a limit to the number of minor offences which constitute a career from which the only item absent seems to be a spell of honest work. What on earth is the reason why it was not cut short long ago? How has this ruffian contrived to flash about the world in diamonds while honest men have starved and died?

"Where's the police?" is the natural cry. There is something in it. It is highly discreditable to our protective and preventive systems that such a career as Deeming's is possible. The man made little attempt at concealment. He even courted notice. His appearance was uncommon, and he was not chary of displaying it. That alone ought to have ensured his capture long ago. He could not keep his mouth shut or his face hid. There was something of Pan-puk-kee-nis about him; the very means he took to cover his retreat his vanity caused him to proclaim, as it were, on house-tops. And for all that he was not found out. An uneasy doubt arises whether there are not more Deemings going up and down the world. Apparently the police will not interfere with them.

But there is more behind. Not even an efficient police force, which we have not got, can protect people who will not protect themselves. A Scotland Yard detective is a very poor kind of guardian angel, but a whole legion of guardian angels could not have saved the unhappy woman, for instance, who was so ill-advised as to take Deeming, for better or worse, on the strength of his rings and his lies. So long as there are people who can't, or won't, discriminate between true metal and false, and will run after anybody who can tickle their vanity, or gratify their curiosity or cupidity, so long will there be many Deemings and many victims.

There is something shocking in the ease with which Deeming pushed his way into those circles which he pretended to adorn. The means he adopted were simple, even monotonous, nothing but a display of wealth. Thereupon houses opened to him, intimacy was accorded him, parents trusted him with their children, women confided to him their honour and their lives. Questions were not asked, at least not pushed, and had he been gifted with a little more intelligence he might be a prosperous man at this moment.

A thousand serious things are suggested by this man's history, but after all this is the most important—this reckless and fatuous snobbishness which seems to tyrannise over our very lives. Of all the miserable spectacles in the world, none is more miserable than this, of all sorts and conditions of people throwing themselves down to destruction in this spirit of hopeless vulgarity. Deeming succeeded just because he represented the ideal of thousands of vulgar people. They too wished to flash diamonds and sport immense watch-chains, they desired to become centres of admiration and attention, by the means and in the manner that he was; they were deceived by no astute devices and ingenious tricks, they were simply taken on their weak side, and were accomplices in the fraud on themselves. And so long as they stick to their miserable ideal, and are possessed by the same paltry ambition, they are likely to become dupes and to remain so. Deeming will hang, but his works will not follow him.

THE Hon. Consulting Counsel of the Funeral Reform Association has drawn up a treatise, entitled "The Interment of the Dead: a consideration of the common-law rights and powers of the incumbent, and the rights of parishioners in and over the churchyard, and of certain statutory enactments affecting burial in cemeteries," a copy of which can be had on application to the Secretary, Funeral Reform Association, Church House, Westminster, S.W.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE PENTECOSTAL GIFT.

SIR,—As we are approaching Whit Sunday, I should like to be permitted to ask a few questions on the miracle of the day or to express my opinion. Was not the Day of Pentecost the antithesis to the day of Babel? If so, was not the gift of tongues, the restoration of "The Tongue," for the moment given and appreciated by faithful hearers. And I make bold to say that Peter did not speak in Hebrew, or Greek, or Latin. These languages had been nailed to the Cross, and practically were dead with Christ.

God has many ways of making Himself understood by man, but especially by His Voice, or by inspiration. God conversed with Adam, and therefore had endowed him with a perfect language; and this language need not have suffered by the fall, and may have been retained in its perfection till the confusion (Gen. x. 31), when, as the learned say, it was divided into seventy different tongues; this anticipating by description Gen. xi. 1.

We are told the whole earth was of one language. Now, is it not the case that all languages have some words which may be traced to a common root, and that all languages which have letters, even hieroglyphics, have the mark of the Cross impressed upon them in the T? And in this we may trace that language sprang from a common tongue.

May it not be said, God could not talk in an imperfect language, and therefore in talking with Adam in, or out of, Paradise, God would speak in that perfect language which he first gave to Adam. In the same way, in speaking to Abraham and the Patriarchs, they would hear and understand the perfect language. So of Moses at Sinai, when *he alone* heard the voice of God; or as in the call of Samuel; or in the still small voice Elijah heard. So if in Babel all language was broken up, was not all language restored to unity and only one language—"The Tongue"—spoken, which all believers out of every nation understood at Pentecost? In Acts i. 15 the 120 mentioned there were no doubt included in Acts ii. 1 when gathered into one place, upon whom the Breath of the Spirit fell. The disciples were heard to speak in a language of which they had no previous knowledge. Thus St. Peter, speaking with only one voice, was heard at the same moment by various nationalities, and so of the others who had the gift of the tongue. Then the multitude hearing of it came together, and were amazed because that every man heard them speak in his own language. But outside, or mingled with the 3,000, were mockers or unbelievers (v. xiii.), who said they were full of new wine—drunken. If the 3,000 were grouped together, and the Apostles were addressing different parties according to their nationality, this would not have been said. To them the one Tongue, the language of Paradise (the unique language, as Godet calls it) was a sealed tongue, a mere jargon of sound. And this gift of utterance seems, on the Day of Pentecost, to have lasted only till the baptism of the 3,000. There is no mention of the like gift of tongues till Acts x. 46, granted for the same reason, as that for bestowing it at Pentecost, as a perfect proof of Divine approval, and the admission of the people into the new-born Church. (Smith's dict., Bible page 1557, says of St. Paul, who spake with tongues more than they all, "When he was at Lystra, there is no mention of his using the speech of Lycaonia. It is almost implied that he did not understand it."—Acts. xiv. 11). Then here the Spirit gave him utterance, and as he spoke the people heard him. In the case of St. Paul's conversion, as told by himself, Acts xxvi. 14. If the voice had been Hebrew, as St. Paul might have thought, the others would have understood also. St. Paul heard the Voice, but his companions heard not; they thought it thundered, because being The Tongue—the Divine language—for which their hearts were not prepared.

By some it is thought that making the Pentecostal gift a miracle of hearing, its wonder is lessened. Why so? But in any case the miracle would only reach those whose hearts were prepared. Our Lord, too, had prayed for unity with the people and Himself and the Father; so on the Day of Pentecost He admitted the people into a measure of the Divine Presence that they might hear and understand what was spoken in this gift of tongues under the second Adam, and because it would be so perfect a gift, the Apostles were charged not "to premeditate" that "the utterance might be of God."

In the account of the tongues, 1 Cor. xii.-xiv., it seems to be shown that at the time St. Paul was writing an untruthful claim to the possession of the gift had crept in. St. Paul does not know who, or how far to condemn the statement, so he advises plain speaking instead. The economy of miracles was drawing the supernatural to an end. Common sense was to rule, controlled by a pure religious faith. If not so, why should not the gift of tongues be used now? Tongues that could bear no interpretation must be liable to the suspicion of being only hysterical sounds, though charity might restrain a person from charging the speaker with hypocrisy. From this danger the Pentecostal gifts were free. The language being "The Voice" of God was comprehended by all whose hearts were prepared to receive the message, and so I think only one language was spoken, though the hearers might think they only heard their own.

The word of the Gospels is unalterable now, being retained to us in a language that is dead, and in this fixedness we may see the love of God and is a parallel to the Pentecostal gift.

C. I. W.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION.

SIR,—In reply to "Vindex," I think the texts quoted by me in the PULPIT of 12th March establish the grand purpose of God to bestow immortality and a loving union with Himself on all the race of Adam. "Vindex" again refers to idiots as if their mental derangements were owing to incurable defects in the spiritual nature, and not merely to celebral disorders, which affect the spiritual nature in this life.

As far as I understand the currents of thought in our day, it is generally admitted that *aiôn* and *aiônios* do not mean endless. That which "Vindex" calls *eternal* destruction, is in reality *aiônial* destruction, that is to say it is not endless. Viewed in relation to the loving purposes of God towards His intelligent creatures, which appear to me clearly made known, *aiônial* destruction is remedial and educational, not ruinous. It is a mystery to me why the Revisers of

the Bible considered the word *eternal* as a fair English equivalent of *aiônios*. To almost all Englishmen it means *endless*, as may be seen on reference to dictionaries. The original words rendered in the Revised Version, "eternal fire, eternal sin, eternal life, eternal destruction," do not mean endless. We obtain the assurance of life and immortality from other texts. In the passages which contain those expressions, I understand that intermediate processes of the most momentous nature are declared, and not final results. Some of the passages indicating processes in the future life are calculated to produce emotions of an appallingly awful character, and seem to indicate a duration of incalculable ages. But I thankfully understand the Divine purpose in all to be the permanent welfare of His intelligent creatures. I, moreover, have a firmly implanted conviction that the Divine sensibilities are deeply and profoundly affected by every pang throughout the universe of intelligent life.

I hold the doctrine of "conditional immortality" in the sense that to have endless life we must be united to Christ. But I also hold, with a grateful, joyful feeling of certainty, that the vast complicated processes which are going on are intended and *fitted* to accomplish that grand purpose in regard to all. I think almost every intelligent mind must perceive the apparently insurmountable difficulties of developing really enlightened freedom of mind and will, in a created being, necessarily dependent every moment of existence on the Creator's presence and energy. To constitute such a being really free and not a puppet is a task so portentous that Locke said the possibility of its accomplishment was beyond his power of conception. I rejoice exceedingly in the belief that it is being accomplished by the wondrous measures which so strikingly display the love and wisdom of God.

J. B.

Canonbury, May 7th, 1892.

QUEENSLAND AND KANAKA LABOUR.

SIR,—I have been rather surprised at the extraordinary statements made by some *Guardian* correspondents in reference to this class of labour, and the facts elicited are such as require explanation by some one who at least knows the true position of affairs. I do not profess to be able to sufficiently explain everything; but, having a knowledge of the labour market at home and abroad, I may in a measure be competent to express an opinion on the subject.

May I first ask if your correspondents have ever been in India when they state that labour for Queensland should be drawn from that point? I have at all events that experience. I have employed the Indian coolie at home and abroad, and I have particularly employed in Queensland Kanaka labour, and all other sorts of labour; and I assert that Queensland planters treat their "boys" better than the West Indian planters—certainly far better than the employers of Indian labour in their native land. In one company under my charge in India the coolie never had a Sunday to himself. He worked on and on every day, although Sunday was never recorded in the pay-sheets. The Indian, when he arrives on the West Indian plantations, gets a swamp to live in, and finds himself in everything out of an average wage of 1s. per day. As to liberty, he can never leave the plantation without a pass. This is what is known as "Government supervision of the Crown colonies;" and still he is comparatively happy, and very often saves money out of his meagre earnings. It is true that a good man can by contract work make more in many of these plantations, and it must be admitted that in most cases a capable labourer can on an equitable standard make more than is required to support himself and family. But if liberty is any consideration, give me Queensland, where the Kanaka, when off duty, can do as he pleases. He builds his own hut according to his taste, he is fed and clothed, and practically wants for nothing.

At the end of the term for which he is engaged he is entitled to return to his island free of all cost, and, if he so elect, return to his employment with his passage paid. During the term of his employment he can save every penny of his wage. Can any one desire more? If any factory hand in this great country had half the consideration should we hear anything of Socialism? How can Kanaka labour interfere with the white colonist? It is an indisputable fact that several hundred women and children in Brisbane could not a short time ago pay the 1d. ferry fare to cross the river to the soup-kitchen. I could not ten years ago in Northern Queensland procure half the labour I required; indeed, I have known a gang of men leave me without a moment's notice, because they were not supplied with plum-pudding three times a week, although their ordinary daily rations consisted of beaf-steaks, flour, potatoes, tea, and sugar *ad lib.*

Through the suicidal policy of excluding a class of labour to carry out the particular work in connection with plantations which the white man could not do, owing to climatic influences, opportunities have been lost; but by the reintroduction of Kanaka labour, the position of Queensland tropical industries may not only be retrieved, but in the future would progress and surpass all former records.

D. STUART.

16, Great George-street, Westminster, S.W.,
May 7th, 1892.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Addams-Williams, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Curate of Cheddar Rector of Llangibby-with-Coedypaen Chapel, Newport, Monmouthshire.

Anson-Frith, Rev. G. W., Minor Canon of Durham Cathedral; Assistant Diocesan Inspector for the Diocese of Durham.

Aspinall, Rev. Noel Lake, M.A., Curate of Eccleshall, Sheffield; Vicar of Holy Trinity-with-Christ Church, Chesterfield.

Baker, Rev. Charles; Rector of Penhurst, and Vicar of Ashburnham, Sussex.

Baker, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Nether Wasdale; Vicar of Burgh-by-Sands, Carlisle.

Bazalgette, Rev. Evelyn, M.A.; Rector of Monk Soham, Suffolk.

Beloe, Rev. H. J. Greswell, Curate of St. Barnabas's, Homerton, London; Perpetual Curate of Euxton, near Chorley.

Browne, C. Gordon, M.A.; Rector of St. Mary's, Lympston, Devon.

Burney, Rev. Edward Moore, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Edmonton; Vicar of St. Peter's, Droitwich.

Caulfield, Rev. St. George H. W., Senior Curate of St. James's, Bristol; Incumbent of Melrose, Wilmington, South Australia.

Clark, Rev. Charles Francis, M.A.; Rector of Drayton Parslow, Bucks.

Cobb, Rev. William F., B.D., Curate of St. Luke's, New Kentish-town ; Assistant Secretary of the English Church Union.
Colson, Rev. F. T., M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Warley ; Vicar of St. John's, Reading.
Dewing, Rev. Richard Standly, M.A., Curate of Great Waltham, Chelmsford ; Vicar of North Weald, Essex.
Donne, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Wakefield ; Archdeacon of Huddersfield.
Ford-Thursby, Rev. W., Bergh-Apton, Norwich ; Rural Dean of Brooke, Western Division.
Gibson, Rev. Richard Hudson, M.A., Rector of Lound, and Hon. Canon of Norwich ; Archdeacon of Suffolk.
Gordon, Rev. H. D., M.A.; Prebendary (Wykehamical) in Chichester Cathedral.
Harris, Rev. Richard Henry, M.A.; Rector of St. James's, Longton.
Hartley, Rev. John ; Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Oare, Wilts.
Holt, Rev. George Owen, Rector of Whittington ; Vicar of Great Haywood, Stafford.
Hutton, Rev. F. R. C., M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Bolton ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Kenyon-Stow, Rev. L. D., Vicar of St. Mary Elms, Ipswich ; Chaplain to the Loyal Suffolk Hussars.
Lloyd, Rev. William ; Vicar of Resolven, Neath.
Lunn, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Vicar of Dacre, Leeds ; Vicar of Christ Church, Shieldfield, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Merriman, Rev. George. M.A., Vicar of Martham, Norfolk; Rural Dean of the Deanery of Flegg.
Openshaw, Rev. Thomas Williams, M.A., Second-Master at the Bristol Grammar-school ; Rector of Middleton - Cheney, Banbury.
Panter, Rev. C. R., M.A., LL.D. ; Summer Chaplain, Holy Trinity, Pau.
Pegg, Rev. H. Foster, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Birmingham ; Vicar of St. Matthew's, St. Leonard's-on-Sea.
Rogers, Rev. Joseph Edmund, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Tunbridge Wells ; Vicar of Great Yarmouth.
Sampson, Rev. Edward, Vicar of Maryport ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cumberland (Mr. H. P. Senhouse, Netherhall).
Sharp, Rev. B. Oswald, Vicar of St. Peter's, Clerkenwell ; Vicar of Heston, Hounslow.
Singleton, Rev. Canon John Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Melbourne, Derbyshire; Rural Dean of Melbourne.
Sparshott, Rev. Thomas H., Curate of St. Mary, Halifax; Clerical Deputation and Organising Secretary of the Church of England's Women's Missionary Association.
Talbot, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Christ Church, Shieldfields, Newcastle ; Vicar of Dacre, Leeds.
Tomlinson, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Great Haywood, Stafford; Rector of Whittington, Chesterfield.
Trebeck, Rev. Canon John James, M.A., Rector of Southwell; Rural Dean of Southwell.
Wardroper, Rev. Arthur Stocqueler ; Vicar of Alwinton-with-Holystone, Northumberland.
Winning, Rev. William; Chaplain of St. Anne's Home, Bridlington Quay.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ackland, Rev. Thomas Suter, M.A., Vicar of Wold Newton, on the 4th inst., aged 75.
Bell, Rev. Walter, Canon and Chapter Clerk of Cumbrae Cathedral, Honorary Chaplain St. Mary's Cathedral and "Forbes" Librarian, Edinburgh, at Edinburgh, on the 4th inst.
Bennett, Rev. Hugh, Rector of Croome D'Abitot and Pirton, late Vicar of Elmley Castle and Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford, at Pirton Rectory, on the 5th inst., aged 74.
Bull, Rev. Henry Dawson Ellis, M.A., thirty years Rector of Borley, at Borley Rectory, on the 2nd inst., aged 59.
Holmes, Rev. Edward, Rector of Barrowden, at Paston Rectory, on the 30th ult., aged 70.
Johnson, Rev. Henry Isaac, late Head Master of the Royal Institution School, Liverpool, and formerly Rector of the Grey Institute, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, at Penrhyn House, Ullet-road, Liverpool, on the 6th inst.
Keith-Douglas, Rev. Francis Sandford, at São Paulo, Brazil, on the 9th ult.
McNiven, Rev. Charles Maunoir, at Perrysfield, Oxted, on the 6th inst., aged 73.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following :—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

OUR APPOINTED SPHERE.

By Rev. CANON SCOTT-HOLLAND.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, May 8th, 1892.

"Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following, which also leaned on His breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth Thee? Peter, seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou Me."—John xxi. 20, 21, 22.

SIMON PETER is so interesting a character because he surrenders himself, whole and undivided, to the full force of a present impression. Whatever it is that is acting upon him, to that he yields himself with the frank simplicity of a child. He has no self-conscious reserve, no suspicions, no suspensive reflections to make; his entire being lies transparently open and receptive, and so it is that the full pressure of each situation tells upon him, and, passing straight through him without let or hindrance, its effect upon him issues at once through his lips in the first expression that comes to hand. Thus it is always, we know, the perfect mirror of the moment's meaning. He is quick to feel, and quick to utter what he feels. No self-regard for consistency troubles him; what does his own reputation matter? He has no after-thoughts; he speaks out what is in him, and that is enough. And this temper of rapid susceptibility has its weakness as it has its strength. It has weakness, for it renders him liable to surrender to momentary panic. It is he, so tenderly sensitive to the personal influence of the Master, who is also equally sensitive to the chilling atmosphere of disappointment. He succumbs when that Personal Presence on which he relies is withdrawn, and in its place is the contempt of the servants of the High Priest and the light scoff of the peasant maid. And as out from his lips his temper always leaps in swift words that cannot be recalled, so that fatal speed with which he reveals every changing mood has carried him headlong into his threefold denial before he is aware of what he is doing. And yet, with all its risks, this receptive, fervent heart has a strength of its own which the Master, who knows what is in the man, values highest, it seems, above all. That unqualified, spontaneous self-surrender, which seemed to make Simon the plaything of passing impressions, a vane that veered so fast with every wind that blew, served also to lay him open, beyond all others, to the power of the Lord's personality; the guileless transparency gives himself away to the Master's handling. He has the susceptibility of a faith that sets no limits on its own loyalty. And therefore he was again and again borne up beyond the barriers which encumbered and delayed others. He took in the meaning of Christ while they were still slumbering, he spoke out the word which others felt after and could not find—headlong in wrong, he is headlong also in right. Though at one moment he might call down upon himself the rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan, thou savourest not of the things that be of God," yet at another, and almost at the same moment, he was invoking the cardinal supreme benediction, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven." How strange to us that this man, fluctuating, impulsive, and rash, should be the one whom the Lord delighted to associate with the rock and with the stone. How different from what we should expect! We should look for the qualities of the rock or the stone in some hard-headed, cold, reasoning character, which was insensible to influences from without and to impulses from within, self-contained, self-controlled, slow, silent, deliberate; but no! when our Lord needs a stone for the building which will stand fast and sure, He finds it in the exactly opposite type, in a man who never deliberates, never reasons—a man who is childlike in his impressionableness, and whose characteristic in speech is that he wists not what he says. The child's heart, the child's spontaneity, the child's freedom, if these could be rescued from the risk of fluctuation, they would be stronger than iron. And they can be fixed by one motive, and one only, by the sway of a personal attachment. A child's love in its fervent ardour would make all the rest sink; once obtain that, and then you would have in such a character as this that which fires would not burn nor floods drown. Love would do it—intense personal love. Then the man whose susceptibility to change has associated his name, through his denial, with the weathercock veering through every wind, would become as an adamantine rock, fit for the foundation of the Eternal House. Love would fix it. And, therefore, Jesus asks of him but one security: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?"

Forgive me for dwelling on the interest of his character, but my text offers an admirable instance of what I have been attempting to describe. St. Peter had just before been the one to give voice to that vacant sense of having nothing to do, which was spoken instinctively in his proposal, "I go a-fishing," but now he is the very first to apprehend the new and anti-typical revelation, "Feed My sheep, tend My lambs." So the Lord had spoken, and in a moment the loyal disciple has flung himself into the currents of thought which the news

has set flowing. There is to be work, there are to be places to be allotted, offices to be fulfilled. Instead of the desultory fishing which he had vaguely conceived as filling up the time, there was to be a kingdom of distinct and responsible activities; he was to be busily engaged himself in a commission and task; there would be order, regularity, decision, right to the close of his own days; the Lord had looked and had foreseen his allotted path; surely, then, it would not be for him alone that this appointed career was laid down! No! All would have their place, their function, their charge, everywhere and for each the way would be ordained, each would travel steadily forward towards an anticipated goal. The Master would not be far away and hidden, as they had imagined, but would obviously direct and determine the whole. If he, Simon Peter, is to follow Him in unbroken confidence through the long years, tending, feeding, shepherding, so, too, with the rest. And why not, then, see it all at once? Why not have it all told him? Here is John, for instance, as he turns his eyes full on him—he is his nearest and his dearest friend, dearer than a brother—what joy to see and hear what his office should be, how he should serve, how his lot would be cast; all Peter's warm affections bubble up on to his lips as he passes from himself to his friend, that friend so dear to him and yet so profoundly different to himself; that friend so meditative, so deep, so silent, so absorbed — passionate, indeed, yet with a passion that broods on in silence, in suspense, in inarticulate struggle, in long-gathered, slow, pondering thought, hidden in some voiceless abyss of spiritual reserve. Could anything be more unlike than these two? And perhaps it is this very contrast which makes Simon Peter so keen to reach forward and learn the history of his brother. What would it be that those strange powers would have to do? What beautiful use would be found for them? "Lord, and what shall this man do?" It was asked in the ardour of love, in the glow of confidence, but he had overshot the limitations set on human faith, it was met with a sharp check, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

There are purposes and counsels in the Lord's mind which go far beyond the reach even of the chief of the Apostles. Enough for him to grasp and comprehend that tiny portion of the scheme which concerns himself; his own special work and office are marked out for him, he can recognise within them the Master's will and guidance and intention and sanction, he can feed, he can tend, that is his task. But others have their own fate to follow, their own task to achieve, each in his separate responsibility, each in his own splendid and royal solitude, will have to answer to the Lord Himself for what he does and to no other. For no other can penetrate the secret message that passes rom the Master to their souls, bidding them do this, and they do it. So rich, my brethren, so distinct, so inexhaustible, is the variety of men's characters and functions, and all this variety will be allowed for in the new kingdom. One will be used in one way and one in another, and the part of two, even though they be near and dear to each other as brothers, may yet be so remote in type as to be hardly intelligible even to each other. Here is this John, whom Peter loved, "If I will that he tarry—that he tarry." He is one whose gifts may have to be held in reserve for many a long year. Slowly, very slowly, he will grow to his perfect maturity. He is the man whom the Lord may need to keep very long before his service is at an end. How different from this eager, direct, practical force of Simon Peter! Simon is ready for use on the instant, everything in him rushes him to the front at a bound: there is no reticence, no process of secret storing, out it all comes in word and in act. His first thoughts are his best, his instinctive, immediate deeds come straight from the heart. But reflection and consideration may bewilder and paralyse, as they did later on at Antioch under the pressure of those that came from James. With him all is practical, swift, direct; but let him learn once and for all that there is another character—faithful as he, fervent as he, yet one that tarries long. Year after year will have passed, and all things will begin to grow very old, and sadness and disappointment at prolonged delays will increase, and the first love of the Church will grow cold, and still that silent man there, who lay on Jesus' breast at supper, will brood on and on, and still he will not speak out all that is in him, and still he will nurse his own inner secret, and consider, and ponder, and shape, and reshape the message he has to deliver. Still he will keep himself reserved, secretive, absorbed, and concentrated, and still he will wait, and pause, and linger, gathering in all the resources of age, all the graduated teachings of experience, line upon line, precept upon precept, fashioning, moulding, deepening, translating all those manifold elements accumulated through the lengthening days, so that they all may conspire to expound and interpret the one unchanging Gospel of his incarnate Lord. No haste, no hurry, no unpremeditated instinct, no headlong impulse, will do work like this. He must tarry so long until men ask, "Will he ever have done?" He will tarry so long till men wonder, "Will he ever die? Will he not wait here on earth till the Lord comes?" He will tarry until they look on him as we look on some of the people that the slow generations have laboriously piled together, full of patience, awe, endurance, skill, perfection, and glory. Thirty years after, Simon has been girded by another, and carried whither he would not; John will yet be there, still ripening, still accumulating, refining, perfecting. Only at the very close of the days the fruit will have taken its full increase, and the

silent, brooding preparation will at last have been completed. The heart, chastened and transfigured by a century of thought, will at last deliver its finished message from the lips, and utterance will be attained. We shall hear him speak that which the long tarrying has enabled him to speak, and he will say: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." That will be his lot, but with such a lot, with such training, Simon Peter has no part, it is one which could never be his. It is one of the mysteries into which he could not enter by his own experience. Let him be satisfied, then, if the Master knows how to direct and govern the brooding love, the pondered utterance of John just as well as he knows how to manage the quick impulse, the keen activity and the flashing energy of Simon. Let him leave each separate development to Christ. Love John as Simon Peter may, he cannot penetrate that private secret of his and say for himself, "There is but one thing of primary importance, to accept the Master's guidance of his own life, to walk along the path by which he himself is led." He cannot interfere with others' responsibilities, by their own must they stand or fall. Let him be true to himself and all is well. "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou Me."

"Lord, and what shall this man do?" This is a question that should come readily to our lips, and the more we care for men, and the more we believe in Christ, the more instructive and natural the question should be, for it springs out of faith. Christ is risen, Christ is ascended, Christ is head of His Church, Christ is Lord of all the earth. Therefore, of course, this truth has burnt its way into us, we cannot but keenly feel that each moment a new life opens, a new treasure is uncovered. What is it that will open? What will the Master do with it? Oh, if only we might know. And never surely since the renaissance first broke in upon Christendom has there been a time when there was more to provoke such an inquiry than now. The years are hurrying upon us, loaded with fresh and unanticipated wonders, new gifts, new possibilities, new endowments, new knowledge, new aspirations, new modes of literature, new modes of art, all are poured out in profusion. All the amazing range of possibility is open for human society, for human science, for human skill! We are bewildered by the very abundance of our opportunities, and as our amazed eyes fall on this or that splendid capacity which civilisation has disclosed to us, our first thought should be, if our faith were real, "How is this to be brought into the service of Christ? What use, what profit for the kingdom? What is this to do for the Church which is charged with the task of laying out all the Master's treasure at usury? Look at it all, this expansion of England, this strange freedom into which science has brought the whole earth, this inrush of new political forces, this infinite novelty of knowledge which is ever sweeping dominions and worlds into our ken! Oh! that we could know what would come of it, how it will be all included and absorbed within the Christian experience, how it will finally serve to interpret, to justify, to enhance, to glorify the Catholic creed." "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" My brethren, have we, indeed, faith buoyant enough to ask such a question; have we faith enough to believe and to expect that Jesus Christ has a use for all these new ideas and ideals, that He is their Lord and Master, that He does cover them with His great purpose? Do we start with the assurance, however bewildering these novelties may look now, that they still are bound in some form or other to pass within the sway of the Spirit, within the borders of the Church, to take their due place amidst Christ's material subjects, or are we simply angry at the disturbance of their arrival, causes which have upset all our settlements by the necessity of dealing with new ones? Are we angrily bent on excluding them, to determine that Jesus Christ shall have nothing to say to them, nothing to prophesy for them, no control to exercise over them, and are we content to suppose that the reign of this risen Lord is for the future to have no meaning at all for the main bulk of secular thought, whether critical, or scientific, or social? We know, alas! that at the present moment this is terribly near to being the case, that the lay world in science, in literature, in politics works mostly without including Christ. It has learnt from us to believe that Christ has very little to say or do with the modern mind, and, therefore, in view of this momentous peril it is needful for us to stir up the gift which is within us, needful for us to insist that Christ claims all and has a purpose for all, whether new or old; needful for us to kindle in ourselves the faith that we actually believe this, the faith that will at least desire to ask, in view of each intellectual discovery or each social movement, "Lord, what is Thy mind here? what is it that Thou hast in view hereafter as to this?" Better, far better to be ready to ask this question, as was Simon, than not even to wish to ask it at all, "Lord, what shall this man do?" Perhaps in these larger affairs of the world we are too sluggish to ask the question, but at any rate in other matters we come nearer to Simon Peter's haste and ask it too readily. In Church matters, for instance, you instinctively desire to fix precisely the direction in which a movement or a character should go, the grooves into which it shall run, and all the more if we ourselves have received from the Lord any distinct impress of His will, our commission; our task has been given to us to work out, we are sure of it, we have brought it under Christ in obedience and in love. Some work in His Church has been given us to do—feed His sheep, tend His lambs; we are aglow, we are athirst. Right

ahead we see stretching a blessed path laid out for us to walk in right to the end. All through life we shall in this way be busy in fulfilling what are the clearest parts of His will. We ask of others who, like ourselves, are loyal to the Master's service, "Lord, what shall these do? Let us understand their part. How will they work in with us?" So we ask, and our eagerness is always brought up by a violent check. These others are always travelling along ways we cannot quite comprehend. Even when their devotion to Christ is plain to us, their purpose and their use is hidden. What are they at? Whither do they tend? We do not seem to get the cue, we do not seem to get insight into their work; it is such a different type of service from ours. And this contrast will be specially striking when, as in my text, it is between a man of action and a man of thought. These first cannot detect any results, they say, in those others, no obvious good accomplished by them. Their own activity is so direct and so undoubted, it has its fruit in the immediate present; sheep are fed, lambs are tended, all is for good; but those others, those idealists, those thinkers, they do nothing practically, after their standards, so silent, so reserved, so slow they are. A hundred years hence something may come of it, but we do not know how or what. So it always is, but our Master has the future, you must remember, in His mind as much as the present. He has urgent work, no doubt, for us to do, but all the time He is also engaged in looking ahead, in securing for Himself the service of those who will bear their fruit in the years to come. And these He will keep back; He will not hurry them; they will tarry long before their value is felt; many, many years hence it will be seen what He was doing with them. Let the men of action be satisfied to throw their energies out to the living present, let them leave alone to their own proper destiny the brooding hearts which are held in reserve for the slow hereafter. To his own Master each standeth or falleth, by his own Master and by no other he is judged, and the Master needs an infinite variety of men, none may interfere with another, none, however great, may impose his own type on another. To each there is but one final word, "Follow thou Me." Whatever those others have to do, however much they puzzle and bewilder you, yet back to us comes this oft-repeated adequate command, "Thou who knowest thine own task, who hast received thine own commission, follow thou Me."

Only let us guard against one misunderstanding. Does this mean that each individual believer stands alone and goes his own way, and has no corporate bond with his fellows? Does what we have been saying traverse the conception of a Christian society? Surely the argument goes wholly the other way. It is this very variety and solitariness of the personal character which cries out for a visible Catholic Church, for the greater the varieties of character employed in the work, the more urgent the need for a practical and organic communion between them, within which they may realise their full unity of purpose, within which they may recognise and display their corporate integrity, their union with one another in the one Head, the one Spirit, the one Lord. Just because their offices and their peculiarities are so heterogeneous, so unintelligible often to one another, just because they cannot cross over to each other's point of view, yet all minister to one Master; therefore their separation pleads for the binding benediction of a single and universal worship, one and the same for all at all times and in all places, by which they may all be gathered by virtue of one sanction and commission into one authentic sanctuary, to bow together before one Lord, to partake of one loaf, to share in one sacrifice, to move out in the strength of that one food and the one cup! It is because Peter and John are in their tones and in their careers so far apart that they need a Church in which they will both find themselves members of one body. "Lord, what shall this man do?" We say it over and over again in the daily intercourse of private life. It is the earliest question that pulses through the human heart of a mother as her child is laid in her arms, the new-born babe, with all its wonders to be revealed, all its secrets shut in there so fast. "Oh! what will be its fate, for what gracious purpose has the gracious Father sent through her this new soul into the world. Lord! Lord! what will this babe do?" And again and again as the peculiar characteristics of the child, the youth, the man show themselves point by point, as they take their distinct shape and follow their own growth, as father and mother learn their strange powerlessness to mould that which seems to be their own, as they fall back from it, watching it push its way forward with irresistible pressure, disclosing such latent inclinations, good and right in themselves, yet so different from what they had schemed; and as they recognise the sacred mystery of its single soul's solitary dignity, still they would but yearn in their silent love to whisper the old question, "Lord, tell me in the end what shall this man do"; or, again, each time that we, who are older, catch sight of some fair young face—strong, gifted, and pure—some face rich with high promise and undimmed by sin in the glow of its beautiful innocence, in the glory of its loyalty to God—some face upturned towards the light, instinctive with hope and with love, and prophetic of all that which may be revealed in the sudden joy of such a sight, how we forget our own grey skies and flagging spirits and spoilt work and lost opportunities and ruinous sins, while we turn to ask, with all the kindling excitement of a present faith, "Lord, what shall this man do?" So we shall ask, and it is faith—the zeal of faith—which prompts the question, but we shall not win an answer. It is

beyond our ken! Tenderly, but firmly, the Lord will press us back into the plain, the narrow way of duty. Whatever He may plan and scheme for those others; whatever the Father may hold in store for them—what is that to us? He is the sole Master, "Trust Me; be not afraid." Whatever comes, it will be wholly unlike what we should guess. We have this one responsibility to fulfil: "Follow thou Me." Suffer Jesus to take His own course for the souls He has chosen—yea, even though they be near and dear to us as our own flesh and blood, even though they be our own children, there is still a secret that passes between Him and them into which we cannot enter. We may help them, care for them, pray for them, love them with all our heart and all our soul—but after all is done and all is said they are His, not ours. We do not own them; their souls are in His hand. But we will keep off and wait to see what He will do with them.

For ourselves, hard though it be for parents, for teachers, for the elders yearning over the souls that have the future in them—hard to learn it; yet, still, it will be accepted. "Follow thou Me." Follow thine own path laid down; work out thine own salvation according to the measure revealed to thee; answer for thyself for thine own perseverance; play thine own part, labour in thine own office, in the ministry given thee of Christ; seek thine own evidence for the ascended Christ in the assurance of His guidance! And seek it to-day! Follow thou Him now! Others may tarry in future; now is the moment to follow—even now, tarrying not at all. He is standing by thee with that unheeded demand which He presses yet again and again upon thy soul, "Follow thou Me!"

SEEING AND BELIEVING.

By the Rev. JOHN SELLER, F.S.Sc., Curate of St. John's, Cleckheaton, Yorkshire.

Sermon Preached in St. John's Church, on Sunday, April 24th, 1892.

"And Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."—S. John xx. 28, 29.

WHEN the risen Lord appeared to His disciples on the evening of that first Easter day, Thomas was absent. Why he was not with the Ten on that memorable occasion, we know not. Perhaps he preferred "to wait in solitude for some light upon the mystery of the Passion." And yet we see that he was a loser in not being with his fellow-disciples on that occasion. We cannot neglect public means of grace without in some way being losers thereby: we shall be spiritually poorer and feebler through our absence. O Thomas! where wast thou on that never-to-be-forgotten evening when the risen Saviour revealed Himself to thy brethren? Hadst thou been with them, thou also would have seen those pierced hands and that wounded side, and their gladness would have been thine.

Yet because he himself was not present, and had with his own eyes seen the risen Lord, he at once, when the Ten said to him, "We have seen the Lord," refuses to accept the fact. He must see and handle for himself: "Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe." As we shall see, it was a perilous demand to make. How could he know that such a test would ever be granted? Was not the testimony of ten men, and these men fellow-disciples, enough to have scattered for ever the last lingering doubt, and to have filled him through and through with the quiet gladness of those who believe?

Nor can we suppose that the fact of the Lord's resurrection was told him by the Ten only. Others, too, would assure him that they also had seen the Lord, and yet for a full week Thomas resolutely sets aside all testimony from whatever quarter it comes and persists in his perilous demand.

Yet we must not judge him unjustly. He does not scornfully declare that he will *never* believe in the Lord's resurrection, no matter by what evidence it might be attested. There may be reasonable doubt where there is no real unbelief. It is only when a man nurses and persists in his doubts in the face of the clearest and fullest possible testimony that he gradually passes into the character of an unbeliever. The test asked for by Thomas was not that of a faithless heart, although, as Christ's words spoken to him on that second Lord's day imply, to demand such a criterion ere he would believe, revealed a state of heart and mind which might only too easily endanger and destroy the faith he already possessed.

On that second Lord's day the disciples are again "within and Thomas with them." They are no longer assembled "for fear of the Jews": the vision of the risen Christ had banished fear and His peace taken possession of their hearts. It does not seem that the Saviour had manifested Himself to His disciples during the previous week, and they might naturally look for some further manifestations on the return of the day of His resurrection. The fact that Thomas was with them on this second Lord's day seems to show that the reports respecting the resurrection had made some distinct impression upon his mind: he is waiting to verify the fact for himself. It also showed that they had not shut him out from their companionship because he had not accepted their testimony—"We have seen the Lord." We may well believe that the Ten would be both astonished at and grieved with him for disbelieving their words,

and for insisting upon what must have seemed to them a very strange test. But doubting, hesitating, rejecting even their testimony, Thomas is still their brother. He might differ from them in his opinion and belief; they could still love him. Is there not a lesson here, dear brethren, for us? How apt we are to entertain depreciatory feelings towards those who think differently from ourselves, especially on religious subjects. We sometimes find it rather difficult, do we not, to regard and treat as brethren those who do not happen to belong to the same Church as we do? There are few characters nobler or more lovable in this world than that which seeks to bear another's burden—weeping with those who weep, rejoicing with those who rejoice. Who shall say what might have been the effect upon the heart and mind of that doubting disciple had the Ten, during that first week after the resurrection, branded him as an unbeliever and cut him off from their companionship? But Thomas was with them.

"Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith He to Thomas, reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless, but believing." For the Ten it was the recalling and confirmation of their blessed experience of a week ago; it was in particular a revelation to him who had hitherto rejected all testimony to the fact of the Lord's resurrection. The doubting, exacting disciple now finds, perhaps to his astonishment, that both his unwillingness to believe and the test he had demanded are known to another besides the Ten. Nor does it appear, when the opportunity was granted for applying the test asked for, that Thomas availed himself of it. The sight of his risen Lord was enough. But his doubting is gently rebuked: "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: *and be not faithless, but believing.*" What Christ said is more accurately expressed by the phrase, "*Become* not faithless, but believing." By cherishing this doubting and hesitating spirit, Thomas had—from the moment when he disbelieved the testimony of the Ten—been gradually, though unconsciously, drifting nearer and nearer to that point on reaching which doubt passes into blank unbelief. And so, dear friends, we may, I think, see in this appearance of our Lord to His disciples on that second occasion a revelation of the mercy and love of the risen Saviour; and especially was it such to Thomas. It was, we may think, necessary that one who was to be a witness of "Jesus and the Resurrection" should have *seen* the risen Lord; and so full, so overwhelming was the revelation, that it drew from the now no longer doubting but believing disciple that simple confession, which has been described as the noblest "heritage of the later Church." No sooner had his risen Saviour thus revealed Himself to His disciples on that memorable evening than Thomas answered, "My Lord and My God." He had seen and believed. That revelation saved him. Instead of becoming faithless—drifting back to the old earthly life, he passes into that blessed certainty of personal and assured conviction which ever springs from a humble, penitent, believing heart, and he becomes henceforth an ardent and faithful witness for his risen Lord.

And yet there are nobler souls than that of Thomas. There are greater and more blessed victories than his. "Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast *seen* Me, thou hast believed: *blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*" These last words would seem to imply that there were some in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood who, although they had not yet seen the risen Saviour, had nevertheless believed, and such a faith being greater than that of Thomas brought with it a greater blessing. The joy of the Apostle was the joy of one who had believed *because* he had seen; nor is there much to encourage the thought that he would ever have believed at all had Christ never appeared to him after he was risen. "Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the prints of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe." These are the words of a man who has bound his faith to the seen and the tangible. If the asked for test failed, his faith would fail too. And therefore when Thomas saw the risen Christ and believed because he saw, the blessing gained was not so great as that which would have been his had he with all his heart accepted the testimony of his brethren when they said to him, "We have seen the Lord."

If we choose to set rigid and narrow bounds to our faith, and refuse to believe everything which does not verify itself to our reason or experience, we must not be surprised if at last the blessing gained is very different from that realised by those humble, penitent hearts, who "have not seen and yet have believed." It is true that in the case before us the demand made was granted, and the result was one of the noblest confessions of the Church of Christ. And yet our Lord's answer to him who made this confession implies that great as was the blessedness and knowledge gained by a faith which had been voluntarily crippled and held back, there were those who, at far less pain and cost, had attained a higher blessing. Surely, dear friends, we are unwise when we refuse to allow our faith to go beyond the seen and the tangible simply because we ourselves have never experienced what Christian souls around us have already gained. If our belief is bound to the seen and tangible, we have no right to suppose that our fellow-disciples are all living the same narrow and cold and worldly life.

And then we must not forget how very much we have to accept in simple, childlike, absolute faith,

if we would really attain to any certainty of conviction and rest of heart. When men ask for this or that truth to be proved to them with all the certainty of mathematical demonstration ere they will believe it, they ask for what in the nature of things is impossible. If reason could solve and grasp all spiritual truths, could make plain to us everything pertaining to this life and the next, where would be the place for faith? There would be neither necessity nor use for it. But is there not much about our own physical earthly life which scientists and philosophers fail to explain? And yet we go on living our life. And when we rise from the physical to the moral and spiritual world, must all be plain, demonstrable to reason, before we will believe? Are there to be no tangled mazes, no labyrinths we cannot track, nothing obscure, nothing we cannot solve and verify by our poor limited minds, when we pass to things spiritual and eternal? If we cannot comprehend the mysteries connected with our earthly and physical life, are we to be able to see and handle and understand everything belonging to that higher life ere we will believe? It is a perilous demand to make. Yet some have said with the Apostle, "Except we shall see . . . we will not believe." They have asked for the impossible: the vision never came to them in this world. Voltaire, the great apostle of atheism in France, made this demand. But did reason alone conduct him to true knowledge and peace? We are told that when the end came he simply uttered —"I am taking a leap in the dark." Such is the comfort which reason alone can bring when most we need help and light and peace.

There have been others who have doubted that they might believe. They have not scornfully rejected the Bible as a revelation in history from God to man; but finding themselves unable all at once to accept certain truths or miracles contained therein have simply held their faith in abeyance waiting for fuller light, until, in God's time, they too attained that certainty of conviction which comes to a humble, contrite, believing heart. Theirs, like that of Thomas, was a great joy, the joy of the traveller who, having climbed through the mists of the mountain-top, sees the sun flooding all around and below with light and warmth and gladness. It is the joy of those who have "seen" and believed.

And yet, says the risen Lord, "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." "The faith of Thomas is defective as compared with the child-like spirit of faith with which alone we can enter the kingdom of heaven, and hence it is gently rebuked by our Lord. For salvation we must go to Christ, not as reasoning logicians, or learned theologians, or pleading lawyers, or calculating merchants, but as the child goes to its mother's bosom with unbounded confidence and trust." "Blessed" are they who in a humble, contrite, child-like spirit believe God's message to them and wait in patience until the shadows flee and the day-star arise in their hearts. "Blessed" are they who, amid all life's sufferings and sorrows and disappointments, have yet "believed"—believed in a wisdom that cannor err, in the power of a love stronger than death. "Blessed" are they who, although held in and so often depressed by the rigid, narrow bounds of this physical life, have yet "believed"—believed in the nearness and certainty of that world which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," but with which even now they hold sweet communion. "Blessed" are they who, unable to comprehend that great "mystery of love" which led the eternal Son of God to become incarnate and humble Himself "even to the death of the Cross" for our salvation, have nevertheless "believed"—believed not in a dead, but in a risen and glorified Christ, Who ever lives to make intercession for us: "Whom having not seen ye love, in Whom though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls."

WE regret to say that the Bishop of Nottingham is reported to be lying seriously ill at his residence at Leasingham, near Sleaford, Lincolnshire.

AT the Bishop of Llandaff's ordination on Sunday, the Rev. Ll. M. Williams, rector of Dowlais, was the preacher, and Mr. Lovibond the Gospeller.

IT is stated that the Bishop of Peterborough has consented to allow Mrs. Pell, wife of Mr. Albert Pell, J.P., to hold the position of churchwarden at Hazelbeach.

THE Rev. C. H. Lowry, vicar of Kirkby Ireleth, has been granted a license of non-residence on account of ill health, and the Rev. James Sanders Gardner has been licensed to the curacy.

AT the Carlisle Consistory Court held on Wednesday, a faculty was granted for the erection of a cross of Shap granite, about 13 feet high, over the grave of the late Bishop Harvey Goodwin. The designer is Mr. C. J. Ferguson, F.S.A.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the complaints made by the parishioners of Helpston, near Stamford, against the Rev. J. D. Paulett, vicar of the parish, have reported that they find the duties of the incumbency have not been adequately performed.

THE Rev. A. P. Holme, M.A., rector of Tattenhall and rural dean of Malpas, has been offered by the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, and has accepted, the vicarage of Great Budworth, which recently became vacant by the resignation of Canon Moberly. Mr. Holme was appointed to the rectory of Tattenhall in 1870 by the then Bishop of Chester.

DR. EDWARD BICKERSTETH, who has been Dean of Lichfield since 1875, has, it is stated, resigned his appointment owing to increasing infirmities. For some time the Dean has been incapacitated by ill health from performing the active duties of his office. It was mainly through his instrumentality that the west front of Lichfield Cathedral has been restored, at a cost of £36,000 The retiring Dean was a member of the New Testament Revision Company, and was Prolocutor of the Canterbury Convocation from 1864 till 1880.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1892.

CHURCH DEFENCE.

WE grow wiser as we grow older. Those of us who remember the rabid outcry of past years against the Church of England can hardly realise the change which has come over our antagonists in these latter days. The late meeting of the Church Defence Institution will emphasise it. The chairman, the Bishop of London, spoke wisely when he pointed out that the Institution exists more for the good of the country than of the Church. In fact, as far as the Church of England is concerned, there is no particular need for an institution for her defence. She is in no danger; at present disestablishment forms no definite part of the programme of any party, or even any particular candidate.

Not that the attack is altogether given up. The movement for disestablishment in Wales is still kept alive, though we believe it to be moribund. While there is a steady effort made to discredit the Church in the eyes of the English rural voter, backed up and accentuated by a good deal of misrepresentation, which it would be charity to hope arose out of mistakes.

A snake scotched is not killed, and an enemy repulsed is not beaten. It is very necessary not to be misled by the present collapse of the movement for disestablishment; hence the continued *raison d'être* of the Church Defence Institution. Enemies are persistent in slanders and libels. No effort must be spared to meet lies with truth, and even if truth seems now victorious, the hour of victory is not the one wherein to spare our pains.

But beyond the Church Defence Institution lies another line of defence—increased and increasing efficiency. It is noteworthy that the most ardent opponents of the Church are precisely those who will not hear of such a practical test as a census. While maintaining that the Church is effete they carefully abstain from the best means of proving their assertions. Prevented from appealing to figures the lovers of the Church can only point to facts. In towns the facts are overwhelmingly on the side of the Church, and it is notable that in towns the disestablishment movement has well-nigh perished.

How about the country? It is upon the rural voters that the enemies of the Church have lately concentrated their attention, and undoubtedly in this department the Church is slightly handicapped by the tithes. Bad seasons have depressed agriculture; farmers and their men have much ado to keep their heads above water. It is a pull upon the parson to have to demand his tithes. For all that, with casual exceptions, the tithes are paid readily enough. The truth is that our country folk are honest, hard-headed people, who know the difference between tithe and tax, perhaps rather better than the unscrupulous faddists who volunteer to teach them. We attach no great importance to the development of the attack upon the Church in rural districts. We hope the attackers believe what they say, but we see quite clearly, and so do the voters, that it is all nonsense, that the rural parson is not by nature the tyrant he is said to be, and even if he were he has no power to play the tyrant with. The country parson, as the country people know, is generally a mild and gentle person, with a large family and a small income, not by any means hard to deal with, and a very great deal more sinned against than sinning. He is sometimes a little addicted to formalism, more often a little slovenly, humble rather than haughty, not so much inclined to magnify his office as the clerk is, not over-burdened with wits, and yet having all he has constantly about him, dull, but dutiful, not as a rule distinguished by success, yet not easily discouraged, or cast down by failure.

With the real Simon pure before their eyes the rural voters are not very likely to be frightened by the bogie parson of the hustings. And yet there are faults which they would like to see mended in their parish priest.

There is his tendency to formalism. Removed from the varied interests of town life, the country parson is a little inclined to forget the proportions of things, and to attach undue gravity to very little matters. Details of baptisms and burials, pews and perquisites, infinitely tiny affairs—"washing of cups and platters"—these form the subject-matter of almost all parochial quarrels. It is a thousand pities that country parsons so often fail to take a larger view. Until they come to wisdom many causes of stumbling will always be offered to their flocks.

There is a want of *actuality* in his teaching and labours. The country parson is often lamentably out of date and out of touch with his parishioners. Their needs have gone beyond him; he is un-

able to make his voice reach into their daily life—it merely sounds above their heads on Sundays. He is too limited in his thoughts and expressions. There is a great field for the country parson's oratory, when once he understands it, in the common affairs of daily life. He ought to think more often of his people's minds, as well as their souls. After all, his Master has set him the example. Seed time and harvest, the plough and the threshing-floor, the wayside flowers and trees, the thousand and one common episodes of country life, furnished the Founder of Christianity with the texts of many of his sermons. The country parson is too little given to following on the same track. And yet there he will find the secret of influence. If to the prestige of high tradition and old establishment the country parson were to add essential modernness, he would stand on even firmer ground. If he were more, in his professional capacity, to enter into his people's hearts and lives, take them into custody, as it were, and keep them in his ward, his influence would not be soon shaken. As it is they are in no hurry to dispense with him, the more their respect and affection grow into real estimation for real work achieved, which they could enjoy in no other way, the less likely they are to be led away by the Babel in which the tones of genuine fanaticism are only occasionally heard above the din of envy, hatred, and malice.

THE PEACEFUL PERSECUTED STUNDISTS.

SOME of the most remarkable examples of the spirit of Peace are now being furnished by a tolerably numerous section of the Russian peasantry, who are known by the name of "Evangelical Christians," or "Stundists," a name originally applied to some German Protestants in Russia. It is probable that both they and the Germans of the same opinions owe their special religious views to the teaching and example of the Mennonites, a body of Baptists, who have for centuries borne an earnest testimony against war, and who, until recently, were permitted, even in Germany and Russia, to enjoy exemption from military service. They came originally from Holland and the Rhine Valley, and several thousands of them settled in South Russia.

A very interesting paper in the *Contemporary Review* describes the effects which have resulted from the peaceful example of these Mennonite immigrants into Russia, where the drunkenness and immorality of many of the priests of the Greek Church have grieved and disgusted the thoughtful portion of the peasantry. The latter have through the Mennonites, and some German Stundists, been induced to study the Bible for themselves, and in consequence have become convinced of the evil of war and violence. They also reject the worship of pictures, refuse to take oaths, and attach little or no value to ceremonies.

Many of these previously ignorant peasants have set themselves laboriously to the learning of the alphabet, in order that they might be able to read the Scriptures for themselves, and to educate their children in a knowledge of them.

This searching of the sacred volume has rendered the Stundists very kind and patient, both towards their friends and foes. It has also caused them to be far more diligent than before in their industrial occupations. The authorities of the Greek Church in Russia are, however, subjecting these good people to the most cruel persecution, which is being borne with a meekness almost superhuman. Yet some even of the clerical journals admit their piety, and state that "The lofty morality of the Stundists is truly marvellous. Force and violence are foreign to their character; guile and double dealing are banished from their lives; and such is their kind-heartedness that the insults and injustice which they suffer, instead of kindling their anger, evoke their compassion. They do not steal, neither do they drink or swear; and in the ups and downs of life they bear themselves like genuine Christians. Crime among them is almost unheard of; their cherished virtues consist of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, caring for the sick, sheltering the wanderer; and their family life is in all respects exemplary." They declare that "the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world adapts its intensity to each soul"; and they also attach special importance to the reading of the Bible, prayer, and the singing of hymns. These simple services constitute almost the whole of their worship. And their religion is more in act than in word.

The most important point in their doctrines consists in the maintenance of brotherly love towards all men, and industrious work. The Stundists are everywhere known as thorough and sober workmen. One of their chief precepts is that work is a duty and an honour to men, but that it must not be made subservient to selfish ends.

Yet these are the people whom the Russian Government and the Greek Church are now persecuting in the most cruel manner. These meek and humble Christians, so exemplary in their piety, chastity, and charity, are being brutally treated by a drunken priesthood and a licentious soldiery. Their Bible and prayer meetings have been suppressed by the State, and their preachers are being sent to horrible penal servitude in Siberia. Heavy fines are imposed upon every Stundist who can be found; and in order to secure payment of these impositions, their houses and property are sold. They are being ruined in thousands. Yet they are the most industrious and orderly of all the Russian peasantry. And, now, the Russian Government makes it a felony, severely punishable, for as many as three Stundists to pray or read the Bible, even in a private house. Employers of labour are forbidden to afford them occupation. Lists of the names of Stundists are published, in their respective localities, in order that all persons may be put on their guard against employing them. Thousands of their families are already reduced to beggary and starvation. And worse than this, their virtuous wives and daughters are systematically exposed to the brutalities of the licentious Russian soldiery and police. The *Contemporary Review* states that "many of these defenceless women are, night after night, subjected to the grossest obscenities, and to indecent assaults of the most abominable nature, against which there is no remedy and no protection."

Can a Government perpetrating such atrocities upon its very best subjects (and it may be added, inflicting

evils almost as bad, upon myriads of poor Jews), can such a Government expect either prosperity or security?

During the past few weeks many of the friends of humanity, in Great Britain, have subscribed liberally for the relief of the famine-stricken provinces of Russia, in the hope of thereby increasing the good feeling between that country and our own. But there is reason to fear that the poor oppressed and starving Stundists, the most meritorious of all Russians, will be excluded by their own Government from participation in these charities, unless some special influence, on their behalf, can be promptly and successfully excited by the donors of the Famine Fund. It is to be hoped, therefore, that some speedy efforts may be made, in order that a fair share of this bounty may be permitted to reach the afflicted Stundists, for whom Christian Englishmen must feel peculiar pity and sympathy.

DEEMING IT RIGHT—OR WRONG?

GEN. ix 6, Exodus xxi. 12, Lev. xxiv. 17.—From this it is absolutely necessary that "blood" should be expiated by "blood."

Deut. xix.—Even in the case of accidental homicide the avenger seems to be justified in taking life; but to guard against this mischance the Cities of Refuge were established, and in the case of hate—*i.e.*, premeditation (v. 13)—leaves no excuse for not carrying out the law.

Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin (of any kind).

And we are permitted to cause the death of Jesus Christ, and by murder to save ourselves.

Hence an injury of untold measure is perpetrated against a murderer by attempting to save him from execution, by pleading insanity or extenuating circumstances, for his blood is then not poured out to wash out the stain of the murder.

Do not Satan and Hell defeat themselves in the case of "Juggernaut," or especially "African Customs," when the blood of ignorant heathen is shed by hundreds to gratify the passion of cruel kings? They are a law to themselves, and thus under the uncovenanted mercies of God may be in a position to be saved by blood, for the sake of The Blood, of which their blood has been an unconscious type. We who live in the Light can hope that they who are in the Dark may not be then utterly lost. Is this view heretical? INQUIRER.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." May, 1892. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

PROFESSOR DRIVER'S article is nominally, and to a large extent actually a review of Klostermann's work on the Pentateuch; but it is also, and it seems to us more, in reality an attempt to reply to the article in the January number of the *Church Quarterly*. But Professor Driver has done very little more than show that Klostermann, whom the reviewer praised, is in some things as rash as he himself is. This, to say the least, is a very undignified form of argument, and one not generally resorted to by those who have a better at hand.

Dean Chadwick on the "First Miracle" is disappointing: his paper is too much the Gospel account elongated; and he misses, it seems to us, much of the teaching of the miracle, by not observing that it was fresh-drawn water which Jesus turned into wine.

In continuing his papers on the "Atonement," Professor Beet claims that his exposition of Romans iii. 24-26, relieves him "from the difficulty of saying to whom was paid the ransom price of our salvation. It was paid to no one. The phraseology before us is only a metaphorical and expressive mode of asserting the costliness of our salvation." May not the Unitarian reply, Undoubtedly, and so is all the rest of the teaching of the so-called Atonement?

Professor Marcus Dod's "Survey of Theological Literature" will be a very useful guide to both student and reader.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." May, 1892. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

WE are not Baptists, but we are liberal enough to hope Mr. Davies' paper on the "Insufficiency of the Training in Baptist Colleges" may be directly beneficial to his own denomination, and also indirectly to our own Church, by drawing the attention of our own Bishops to our own exactly similar defects. Possibly, as Bishop Ellicott has an article in this number, he may read what Mr. Davies says, and reflect thereon.

Very high praise is given to a sermon by Mr. Bussell; we would suggest that it be republished from the *Oxford Magazine* where it first appeared, into some better-known periodical.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION *VERSUS* AIONIAL PURGATORY.

SIR,—"J. B." is greatly mistaken if he thinks I grudge our friends the "idiots" a share in Christ's salvation or the eternal life which God has promised to us in Christ. I only alluded to them (and to dogs) by way of getting at what "J. B." meant by saying "that immortality is conferred on intelligent beings, and will be sustained." This seemed to me to exclude human idiots and to include intelligent dogs, not to say devils. I found that "J. B." really meant not all "intelligent beings" but only "all the race of Adam without exception."

In the PULPIT of April 23rd, I asked "J. B." if he would "show us where and how 'the Scriptures indicate clearly that immortality is conferred on (all) intelligent (human) beings and will be sustained.'" I urged the same request in the PULPIT of Saturday last. In to-day's PULPIT he replies—I suppose to this request of mine—that certain "texts quoted by him in the PULPIT of 12th March establish the grand purpose of God to bestow immortality and a loving union with Himself on all the race of Adam." Now, supposing for a moment that those texts do establish that—which I am far from really admitting—I submit that that is not only not what I asked him to show, not what he asserted in the PULPIT of the 16th of April, but even something inconsistent with it. Surely, to say that "immortality

is conferred on all the race of Adam, and will be sustained" is not only different from but inconsistent with saying that "God purposes to bestow it," and something else, "on all the race of Adam." I can only suppose that he changes his ground from one statement to the other, because he finds that the statement he first made cannot be maintained. This is a very important matter from my point of view; for if only "J. B." could substantiate that statement of his which I asked him to prove, I would be driven from my position at once, and would have to betake myself to either eternal torment for the unsaved or to universalism. Generally speaking, as certainly at first starting of those two notions, those who hold them begin by asserting the natural immortality of man or of the human soul; and that being granted, either universalism or eternal torment must follow. I am glad to find that "J. B." is an exception to the general rule in this respect. I am glad to find he "holds the doctrine of 'conditional immortality' in the sense that to have endless life we must be united to Christ." That is exactly what I hold. But there we part company, I holding with Christ that some will be "destroyed body and soul in hell," in an everlasting destruction, according to St. Paul; shall "utterly perish," like "natural brute beasts," according to St. Peter; "shall not see life," according to St. John; he holding, "with a grateful, joyful feeling of certainty, that the vast complicated processes which are going on are intended and *fitted* to accomplish that grand purpose (of uniting them to Christ) in regard to all." I must say I think it very hard and very strange if, while some are brought into saving, endless, life-giving union with Christ in a very short space of their mortal lives, others are to have that grand purpose accomplished in them by means of "vast complicated processes" "calculated to produce emotions of an appallingly awful character," and "seeming to indicate a duration of incalculable ages"—in fact, by means of being destroyed body and soul in Gehenna, and of spending incalculable ages in what is truthfully, even if figuratively, described as a lake or a furnace of fire. "J. B." contemplates this alternative, not for himself—he, of course, has got united to Christ by the shorter and simpler process—but for others, "with a grateful, joyful feeling of certainty." I confess I cannot do so; and I am glad to think that I am not called on to do so. It is, to my mind, as unscriptural as it is unreasonable.

I may misunderstand "J. B.," but he seems to me to rejoice that not only union with Christ for endless life and immortality, but also the development of really enlightened freedom of mind and will is being accomplished in all the race of Adam—in some by means of those awful and complicated processes involving a duration of incalculable ages. I do not like to appear personal, but I would like to know if he supposes this development to have been accomplished in himself and other true Christians, or is likely to be accomplished in them, say within the next three-score years. If so, why in the world should it take so long in others when once God takes them in hand? Again, is it a misfortune to be remedied or a fault to be corrected that human beings or "created beings" are necessarily dependent every moment of existence on the Creator's presence and energy?" While so dependent, are they not "really free" but mere "puppets"? Must they, instead of that, be "constituted really free and not puppets"? For myself, I hope in Christ to live for ever, by the grace of God, in glory, honour, and immortality; but I do not either wish or expect even for one "moment of existence" to be "independent of the Creator's presence and energy."

As to the meaning and translation of *aiônios*, I believe it means, and is most properly translated, *eternal*; Also that it ordinarily means *endless*. But, just like the English word *eternal*, or *everlasting*, it is sometimes used in a modified sense. No one supposes that the "eternal" or "everlasting hills" are actually to last to all eternity. "J. B." may depend upon it that in God's promise of "eternal life," and especially His threatening of "eternal destruction," the word is used in its plain, prosaic, literal meaning. Let him ask himself what those who wrote, and those who first read, the New Testament Scriptures understood by "eternal destruction," or indeed by *destruction* or *perishing* without the word *eternal*. If he is the scholar I take him to be, he must know that before, and during and after New Testament times, it was warmly debated by Greek-speaking peoples whether all human souls would live for ever, or would perish at death. And the answer the New Testament gave to those debaters was, that both were wrong; that some, the righteous, would not perish, but live for ever; that none would perish at the first death, but that some would perish everlastingly in the second death.

As to "eternal fire, eternal sin, eternal life, eternal destruction," the word *eternal* in all and each of these does, I submit, mean *endless*, only "eternal fire," and "eternal destruction," mean a fire and a destruction which are *endless* in their results. "Eternal sin," means a sin that hath *never* forgiveness. "Eternal life" is *endless* life, or living for ever—not dying any more.

I wish "J. B." would tell me in his next whether those, for instance, who sin against the Holy Ghost will ever be forgiven, or will they be united to Christ for endless life and immortality without being forgiven?

VINDEX.

May 14th, 1892.

THE CAMBRIDGE CASE.

SIR,—There are two points in the communication in to-day's PULPIT on the Cambridge case which I crave leave to remark on. It is untrue, as said in the communication, that the result of the trial at Ipswich supported the action of the Proctor. The result was that there was not sufficient proof that the Proctor had acted in bad faith, and there was no other result of the Ipswich trial. I pointed out this in my letter in yours of the 9th ult. This is the first point.

The second is, that the proposed compromise, as it is called, is, according to the communication, objectionable, because the borough magistrates are not to be trusted with the jurisdiction contemplated. Swift tells of a politician of his time that when he designed to do anything particularly bad, he caused a report that his enemies were about to do the like; and then, when all men were exclaiming against their wickedness, he stole out and did it himself. This is somewhat like the course pursued by the writer of your communication. A piece of injustice, infamous in kind and in degree, was practised by the clerical judge in the case of Hopkins, who was refused the assistance of a solicitor—a piece of wicked injustice that none but a clergyman could in these times be found to commit. So the Court that it is proposed to

deal with being in its behaviour so bad that it should not be suffered to exist, the defender of this infamous Court has no resource but to revile respectable magistrates. B.

April 7th, 1892.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Angel-Smith, Rev. R. W. Angel, Vicar of Winsley-with-Limpley, Stoke; Surrogate for the diocese of Salisbury.

Beanlands, Rev. Arthur John; Organising Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for the Northern Province and the dioceses of Lincoln, Southwell and Lichfield.

Blair, Rev. William Hugh Thompson, Curate of All Saints', Preston; Chaplain to the Mersey Missions to Seamen.

Burnett, Rev. Arthur David, M.A.; Chaplain to St. Peter's Home and Sisterhood, Woking.

Bury, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Harlestone, Northampton; Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral.

Clarke, Rev. Herbert Sydenham, M.A.; Rector of Colton, Norwich.

Crosse, Rev. E. Francis, Curate of Bedford Leigh; Curate-in-Charge of Heyside, Oldham.

Eames, Rev. J. G., M.A., Rector of West Ilsley; Vicar of Whaddon, Royston.

Evans, Rev. Leonard Henry; Lecturer of the Parish Church of Rhayader, Radnorshire.

Flower, Rev. Walker, M.A., Vicar of Worth; Rector of St. Peter's, Sandwich, Kent.

Garrett, Rev. Henry, M.A.; Rector of North Thoresby, Lincolnshire.

Green, Rev. David, M.A., Senior Curate of St. Nicholas's, Guildford; Vicar of Bramley, Surrey.

Ground. Rev. William David, Vicar of Alnham; Vicar of Kirkharle, Northumberland.

Holme, Rev A. P., M.A., Rector of Tattenhall and Rural Dean of Malpas; Vicar of Great Budworth, Cheshire.

Hudson, Rev. Francis, Curate of St. Werburgh's, Bristol; Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Montpelier, Bristol.

Johnston, Rev. S. A., Curate of All Hallows', Leeds; Assistant-Curate of Immanuel Church, Streatham; with special charge of the temporary Church and district of St. Andrew in that parish.

Kilner, Rev. Francis Charles, M.A.; Vicar of St. Martin's, Potternewton, Leeds; Vicar of Bingley, Yorkshire.

Lacon, Rev. Charles H., M.A., Rector of Braunston. Grantham; Rural Dean of Framland First Deanery.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Abney, Rev. Canon Edward Henry, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield Cathedral, at the Firs, Derby, on the 13th inst., aged 80.

Champneys, Rev. Weldon, M.A., Vicar of Haslingden, Hon. Canon of Manchester, and Rural Dean of Whalley, at Carterplace, Haslingden, on the 9th inst.

Denison, Rev. James Edward, at Durban, South Africa, on the 11th inst., aged 38.

Downes, Rev. W. H., formerly Rector of Llansamnor, Glamorganshire, at Manest Court, near Brecon, on the 9th inst., aged 67.

Fowler, Rev. James T., M.A., Canon of St. Patrick's, Killala, Ireland, and Rector of East Hanningfield, at St. Remo, Italy, on the 13th inst.

Johnson, Rev. James T., M.A., for forty-one years Rector of Britwell, Salome, Oxon, at Britwell Roctory, Watlington, Oxfordshire, on the 9th inst., in his 81st year.

McArthur, Rev. Charles Chapman, Rector of Burlingham, at Burlingham Rectory, on the 9th inst., aged 60.

Moran, Rev. John Henry, B.A., last Vicar of St. Thomas's, Liberty of the Rolls, Chancery-lane, and late Chaplain of the National Hospital for the Paralysed and Epileptic, Queen's-square, at 98A, Southampton-row, on the 12th inst., aged 84.

Parry, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Llanfairisgaer, Carnarvonshire, N. Wales, on the 30th ult., aged 51.

Purnell, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Staverton and Boddington, at the Vicarage, on the 7th inst., aged 78.

Rocke, Rev. Thomas Owen, Rector of Clungunford, Shropshire, on the 11th inst.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time my vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitated for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for more than an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses, Mr. Harness's Electropathic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restoring appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHOICE BETWEEN THE MATERIAL AND THE SPIRITUAL.

By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ripon.

Sermon* Preached in Ripon Cathedral on Palm Sunday, 1891.

"Not this man, but Barabbas."—John xviii. 40.

In reading any story or contemplating any picture we naturally look for those features in which we have the strongest interest and sympathy. A person of strong artistic mind is naturally drawn by those features, which give expression either to the idea of beauty, or to harmony of composition. A person whose mind runs rather in the direction of antiquarian or historical interest watches the relationship of certain features in the picture or story to his particular studies and his previous knowledge. But beneath, and perhaps I will say more important than any of these features, which appeal to the instinct of beauty, or even to the order of knowledge, are those features which reveal the subtler principles which are always at work in the world. And any scene, or picture or story of humanity in drama or incident of the past, yields up as it were its treasure when we observe and inquire from it what are the principles which it illustrates. I would ask you to look at the incident connected with the words I have read rather with a view of reaching the underlying principles which belong to it. It is a scene which I can imagine would appeal to the dramatic instincts of men. There is the surging crowd, and there is the responsible ruler. The ruler, as you know, is in a difficulty, he scarcely likes to act according to his convictions, and yet he would fain find some way by which he could act according to his conviction, and at the same time secure his safety. But the cleverness of an intriguing priesthood is at work inspiring the demands of the crowd, and he has not to deal merely with the well-known unreasonableness of a multitude, but with the unreasonableness directed by those who well know how to manipulate its condition, and he has hit upon the device, which he imagines will extricate him from his difficulty. Having of necessity to release one he offers the alternative to the people of either releasing Jesus of Nazareth, or one the loosing of whom he imagines will arouse all the spirit of animosity and reprobation in the crowd. He picks out a man whose hands are red with deeds of violence, and who might be regarded so far as having drawn upon himself unpopularity because of his seditious efforts, efforts which of course had merited the frown of imperial Rome, and hence the difficulty of the crowd, as he imagines, would land them in a decision in favour of Jesus Christ. Hence he would by the acclamatron of the crowd be released from a difficulty which exists in the *forum* of his own conscience.

But back from the crowd comes the cry and demand, "Not this man, but Barabbas." It is the choice of one who is high-handed, self-assertive, violent, unscrupulous, rather than of one who stands before the crowd as the meek and sinless one, innocent of the charges laid against Him.

Now, when we contemplate such a scene as that, have we not a right to say that this delineates before us some of the strong instincts and principles by which human nature is animated?

Here is the multitude exercising its choice, and the choice falls exactly in the direction in which our better nature would imagine it never would fall, when it falls upon Barabbas instead of upon Christ. If you contemplate the picture, you say at once here is a distinct choice between two distinct types of character, the representation of character which was made in the life and action of Barabbas, and that which was made in the life and action of Jesus Christ—two very distinct views of character. Here on one side is the man who sees a certain object before him, and does not hesitate to use the roughest and readiest ways to achieve it. It is not a question with him of being nice in matters of conscience, he must strain all considerations to achieve what he will. If a little violence is to be done in the gaining of his object, that is an accident in his career, and it does not much matter to him what blood is shed so long as his aim is attained. With Jesus Christ the type of character is in every respect the reverse. Where Barabbas shows self-assertion, Christ shows self-abnegation; where Barabbas reaches out his hand in violence, Christ's hand is reached out to restrain the violent action of His disciples. "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword" is the language of rebuke which falls from the lips of Christ. And whereas Barabbas is keen to have his object at all cost, Christ Jesus thrusts away the darling objects of His soul, if they cannot be won by means which are fair, peaceable, just, and right, hence they are opposed types of character, and the choice of the people goes to Barabbas. Are we to say, then, that here is a great multitude of people actually preferring the strong self-assertive man to one who abstains from self-assertion, preferring this violent character to the man of peace and self-repression? Are we to take this as representing the actual character of the crowd? The answer is often given, you must no

* Printed only from shorthand notes.

argue that these people actually preferred the violent type of character to the personally pure and lofty character of Jesus Christ; you are not to argue that here is a demoralised and demoralising preference for a man of violence and wrong as against a man of purity and peace. Consider for a moment the position which the crowd occupied. Their souls had been stirred by the expectation of One who was to be the Messianic King; they hoped, and all the hopes of patriotism stirred within their veins as they began to hope the deliverance of Israel was near at hand. The King was to come in the name of the Lord who was to restore the royalty of the house of David, give them independence and restore to them the day of their prosperity; but they discover that Christ upon whom thay had fastened their hopes, this Prophet of Nazareth whom they believed was coming to be the long promised Messiah, stood away from their expectations, thrust from Him the opportunities, closed up the paths by which He might have proceeded to win their deliverance. Can you not make allowance for the spirit of tumultuous disappointment embittered by the thought that here was One who might have put Himself at the front of a popular movement and led them on to victory, who might have been the Messiah? Cannot you see with what embittered feelings they contemplate Him who seemed to retire at the last moment from the vantage ground from which He could have effected the national deliverance, and thus their cry, "Not this man, but Barabbas," was due to the bitterness of their disappointed feelings? It was not that they preferred a Barabbas to a Christ, but that they were so angry and indignant at the failure of their national hopes, that they were willing to sacrifice as the victim of their disappointment this Jesus of whom they had expected so much. Suppose we take this as the explanation of it, still what stands before us is this, that here are two men, the one embodying a mode of action entirely different from the other. The mode of action of Barabbas was the mode of absolute violence. Their dream is let us have the material splendour of Israel restored, let us have the kingdom of our Father David, and if the kingdom is established by some bloodshed we cannot imagine that the kingdom is to be established without drawing the sword; and Barabbas embodies in their minds one who stands sword in hand ready to establish the material kingdom. What is the picture which Christ maintains? The kingdom which He comes to establish according to His own statement is a kingdom not of this world. He comes to reveal to them a new order of the kingdom of the Messiah, not established upon the throne of old, nor swayed by the imperial sceptre, but a kingdom to be established in the hearts of men. Barabbas will promise the emancipation of the kingdom, the restoration of their liberties, with power and prosperity given back to them equal to that of Solomon or David. Christ promises the establishment of a kingdom whose law is to be righteousness, and whose spirit is to be love.

Here is the difference between the dream of a carnal glory and the realisation of a spiritual splendour, and when the choice is made between these two, the exasperation of this disappointment, because the temporal kingdom seems to have eluded their grasp, turns into bitterness within them and they are ready to sacrifice this Jesus of Nazareth with His high spirituality, with that pure unsullied life, with that splendid regard for all noble and enduring benevolence, because they are disappointed of the small gains and passing glories which belong to the shadow of a temporal kingdom. Is the scene one that we should dismiss and say, "This is nineteen centuries old, and it has no relationship to human life?" Pardon me, I think that the principles which underlie it are principles which exist always. The choice between Christ and Barabbas was not only made nineteen centuries ago. It is a choice which is made every day, for choice often lies here, are we to give up our preference and our election to interests which give a promise of supplying us with temporal wealth, with affluence and ease, with opportunities of greater social intercourse, these material, these physical, these worldly splendours which are dear to the heart of avarice and the heart of ambition, or shall we choose those other glories which belong to the moral dignity of Christ? Is is not true that on many occasions in our life these come into competition? Suppose the choice is between something that will turn to your financial advantage, and that which will turn to the dignifying and disciplining of your character. Supposing the choice is between this gold or that spiritual access of strength, are there not thousands amongst us who would still make the same choice, following the old lead of the multitude in saying, "Not this man, but Barabbas"; give us the hand that, if it is strong, is yet profitable, do not give us this which could indeed endow us with sweetness and softness, with purity and gentleness, but promises us no tangible, no visible reward?

And now, mark the gradation, not this man, but Barabbas; give us temporal prosperity, material advantage, give us splendour that can delight our life, that can excite our desires, that can satisfy our temporal ambitions; do not talk to us of growing better men; make us richer men; make us stronger men; make us more capable of enjoyment; put the rejoicing power of this world more completely in our natures. But, when the pale Christ moves amongst you, and says, "I will deliver you from the thraldom of your passions, I will establish the law of justice and righteousness within you. Take my yoke upon you and learn of Me, and the discipline of your own souls shall be the elevation of your character; I do not promise to make you richer, I do not promise to make you

greater, but I promise to make you richer in all that ample wealth of the soul which means a development of spiritual force within you; I promise you a greatness which is the greatness of soul, because it shall express itself in greatness of character."

Then we turn and say, "Nay, I do not know that I can give up this real tangible advantage, which will improve my position, which will elevate my reputation in society for the sake of that which perchance may make me better, but I shall not know it." What follows? The cry, "Not this man, but Barabbas," is followed by another. When once men have made their choice for the material as against the spiritual, for this world's passing strength and glory, rather than that eternal strength which belongs to the soul and character of men, they, day by day, become impatient of the presence and of the pressing claims of spiritual power, and the multitude that first says "Barabbas," at least cannot bear the sight of Him who gives the promise of spiritual elevation and spiritual power, and the very voice of the people who cried, "Not this man, but Barabbas," is roused to cry, "Away with Him," and out of the power which would fain put Him out of their sight there comes the worst feeling. They are anxious not only that they should not be asked to look upon Him who makes their conscience uneasy, whose appeal is to their better nature, but their cry is "Crucify Him." They killed the God because they could not bear those calm eyes and that constant look of reproach. Within our hearts the Christ stands, and He puts before us the nobler way, and we choose the baser, and day by day we step lower and we say, "Why have we these things round about us, these powers which are pointing us still onwards and making us uneasy, shut it out from our gaze;" and at last we say, "Crucify it, put an end to its voice, make these eyes which pierce through my soul to grow dim in death; I cannot endure it." And we take the Christ, the Christ that abides within us, the power which prompts us to the good, and we slay it with our own hands; and then we say that the religious teacher who comes and proclaims that human nature shows a latent hostility to evil is uncharitable, whereas even in the experience of our own souls we may have seen the tragedy re-enacted as it was enacted eighteen centuries ago, the tragedy of first choice between our lower as against our better nature, the intolerable feeling which cannot bear the presence of the God, and finally that worst of all deaths, that cruellest of all murders, the death of the appealing power of greatness within our souls.

This, then, is a picture between the choice of that which appeals to material ideas and that which appeals to spiritual emotions, and surely then the lesson which strikes us is how exquisite should be the caution which we exercise in the deliberations of every-day actions. How each action may involve the choice between sacred and carnal things, between that which elevates and that which degrades, how close and minute should be our self-examination lest by any single revolution of our will we should be taking a step downward to the deterioration of our moral character. Let us look at the other aspect, for a second principle is involved. Was there not pathos in the scene when at last the choice is made and Christ is led to die, and here upon the summit of the little hill three crosses are erected, and the malefactors on the right hand and on the left, and in the centre hangs the sinless Son of God, where Barabbas who had done murder in the insurrection ought to have hung, and Christ takes the place of Barabbas? There is a word which has been used in Theology and which has created a considerable amount of controversy, and that is the word vicarious. Whatever your view may be respecting the vicariousness of the Atonement or the death of Christ, I want you to observe this fact that in the personal incident through which Christ takes the place of Barabbas there is a distinct vicarious act. Christ does hang where Barabbas ought to have hung: the guiltless does hang upon the cross where the guilty should have been, so that at least whatever view you may have respecting the theological significance of the word "vicarious," the fact of the death of Christ as it relates to Barabbas is vicarious. The choice was between the two. The choice was for the Galilean that He should hang upon the cross instead of the guilty, who should go free. Now, no word has been used which has become the battle-ground of so much bitter controversy, so much misunderstanding, and associated also with so many gross and carnal conceptions, as the idea of vicariousness with regard to the death of Christ. We are perfectly ready to grant there have been added to that conception things which would have made the earlier teachers turn pale which, after all, might make our sense and instinct of justice shudder. We have no right to take our low conception and attribute that to the character of our Lord Most High. But when people have gone to the other extreme, and said there is no vicariousness at all in this, it seems to me they have forgotten that in their objection to vicariousness they have not seen that to object to the idea of vicariousness is simply to object to nature itself, for if there is anything which nature teaches us, it is that the whole constitution of this world is based upon the conception of vicariousness. There are two aspects in which I would ask you to notice it. For instance, you live in a world which has slowly been discovered in its laws, its conditions, and the principles of its action; and one of the things which we have discovered about it is this: that the universe is like one great organism, that it may be illustrated by the statement that it is like this physical body, "if one member suffers all the members suffer with it," that the whole

power of this little world is so interlocked and interlaced that the slightest touch and vibration of one part communicates itself throughout the whole. In the grand French word it is the "solidarity of life" which has begun to be understood, and the moment you understand that "we are members one of another," the moment you realise that what the Apostle declared so emphatically is that which conscience has made so clear that we are all made of one blood on the face of the earth, then we realise that we cannot move hand or foot, we cannot act small as our influence is without making the influence felt, either to the detriment or the delight of others. That is to say we are so dependent one on another, that constantly throughout the story of human life this tragic element is entering in, that the innocent must suffer for the guilty. Why is it that some go through the world with downcast eyes that they are afraid to raise their eyes to their fellow-men? They have done no wrong, their souls are unblemished, their characters untarnished, not a touch has stained their reputation, yet they go through the world as though verily guilty because there is somewhere written within the story of their life the element which makes them feel that they must always bear the bitter burdens of another's wrong. The vicariousness, the enforced vicariousness of life, forms then their tragedy, and gives it this unutterable pathos. Why is it some men toil as they do? Because perhaps in an earlier generation there were those who squandered their substance in riotous living. Why is it in the agricultural world there often is so much needless toil? Because some heedless man brought a strange plant home with him and without consideration has sown it in the soil; and it has seized on the soil like poison in the air, it has spread and laid hold of the fields, and they must root it out and their toil is increased tenfold; they suffer by the law of the vicariousness, which makes them bear the weight and the burden of the deeds of others. You cannot get rid of it, it is in the life, and the blood that beats in your veins bears evidence of it; the innocent do bear the weight of the guilty, the cross is put upon the shoulders of those who have not done wrong. If this is true in regard to the organism of life, it is also true of the noblest things which appeal to our imagination and our instincts of chivalry, are actions which are distinctly vicarious in their character. Why do these soldiers stir our soul and rouse our enthusiasm as we watch them march through the street? Do you think it is because of the gay colours of their coats, or the martial sound of the drum, is it only that your physical nature responds to the vibration of the stirring and martial music? Do you know that there is something deeper that stirs you, it is because of the vicariousness of the office that these men hold; they represent the glory of your country, they are the expression of strength of the land of which you are proud, and you feel that their acts in the field are your acts; in them England fights, in them England struggles, in them England feels disgrace, in them England triumphs, it is because they stand as types, representative of the people, representative of strength and power, aye, of the destiny of the great people to which they are attached, that, therefore, all they do and dare sends back a throb to your heart, you know you are members of one community, and these soldiers represent the community as they stand in a foreign and hostile land, and their glory rises from the vicariousness of their action. The toil which they undergo, the hardships on the field, the long campaign, the bloodshed you say this is English blood, they are vicariousness of the country, ready to endure all for the sake of the land that is dear unto them. It is somewhat the same aspect of life which is called affection. The affections which appeal to us are vicarious. Love makes its appeal to mankind because of its vicariousness. That dawn of love has so changed the character of the one who loves, that no longer do selfish instincts breathe through the frame, because they have begun to identify themselves with another. Love has the power of identifying itself with another's interest and welfare. That is the reason why man toils for the dear home: he is the vicarious action of activity. What he does is not for himself but for another, and when you talk about the father's love, you mean the love which manifests itself in toiling, ceaseless activities for the sake of those who are in the home. When you talk of the mother's love, you talk of the same parental love, showing itself in the aspect of suffering. Action on the one side, suffering on the other, but vicarious is both because of the toil borne for the sake of others, and because of suffering borne for others. These, then, are types of the highest love, and all effort on behalf of others appeals to us not because of mere outside splendour, but because of vicariousness in their splendour and their virtue. Therefore when I say that Jesus Christ suffers, am I not bound to see in this the expression of that same and splendid instinct? Did He not give Himself up to die? Did He not stand and become in His suffering the means of life to others? As a fact the heaven is open over our heads, and men feel that they are emancipated from the weight and thraldom of many of those hallucinations and dark dreams which haunted them of old. The death of Christ is the expression of the love which acted and of the love which suffered. It was the love which acted. All His life He had toiled for others, and when that supreme hour came and the choice was before Him "will you save yourself, or lay down your life for the sake of others," there was no hesitation, He would not save Himself, no, no effort at escape, no reputation of those around Him, but rather stepping forward to the front "they will seek Me, let these go their way," ready

to stand in the breach, ready to meet the most murderous attacks. He was one that determined at all costs, the cost of His own life, everything should be done that love might show that in its best and noblest moments it was ready to suffer for the sake of others. If that is true, does not another thing follow from it? Why is it that the world has brightened since the death of Christ? I think it is because of old, when men looked round and saw the wondrous thing which we call the enforced vicariousnes of human suffering existed in the world, they said, "Lo! the frown of the Almighty is upon these men." They believed that the sun in his course through the heavens was doomed to torture, enduring the wrath of the immortal gods, because day after day it seemed to meet with the sad misfortune of total eclipse as it dropped beneath the horizon, because there was misfortune there must be guilt. But Christ comes into the world and dies, and henceforth the cloud that covers human thought has been melted away, and love is revealed.

No longer do we say because men suffer they are guilty, and that there is disgrace in the law of vicariousness; on the contrary, there are some who sin, and there are others who bear the pain, and they will no longer say we are disgraced, but they will say, "Thank God that we can stand and bear the burden of those who, if they fall away, at least were well loved by us." No longer are we to say that wherever the shadow of pain, affliction, catastrophe, and disappointment fall, therefore there must be guilt. Christ has swept away the thought; the guiltless one suffers, and in suffering He stands as the Deliverer of His race, in Him meet the converging powers which have been sundered far in the past, He bears the stroke of the guilty, and stands in the noble position of bearing the oppressive weight of suffering in behalf of others. Why, therefore, from this time forward since Christ died pain comes to have new meaning.

He died and suffered, and all who come into the world may trace this out for themselves. This world is filled with struggle, it is a spot of conflict, and it is not for us to shrink and cry out against the blows that fall, but rather should we brace ourselves with fresh courage and say we must sometimes suffer through our own fault and sometimes without our own fault, but everywhere "all things work together for good," and in suffering we are called to be witnesses of this, that there is something better in life than the mere possession of physical immunity from suffering or material immunity from poverty. It is precisely there that Christ shows us one light of hope in life, and do you mark this other light of hope also.

The dread which comes in wrong, and the consequences of wrong falling upon us is not merely the dread of physical pain, but it is the dread also of the underlying significance of things. A man says, I suffer, and I suffer deservedly, and when I think I suffer deservedly, I then think of the great eternal power Who has caused the universe to be framed in such a wise, that the law of retribution works in me, and I not only dread because of the pain I endure, but I dread because I feel that His face may perchance be averted from me. But into the midst of the darkness comes the Christ, the pale face of Him who died on the Cross expressing this: You are not to think wrong thoughts of your Father in heaven, for the animating principle of His action is love. He sent His son into the world to die, but it was to be the revelation of an undying love, for the triumph of love is that love is ready to die, and therefore love can never die; and it is when you grasp this thought that love is ready to die, and yet that love shall never die because it is ready to die, that you begin to understand the splendid thought which the Apostles delighted to dream over, and pore over, and sing over—the reconciliation of the soul of man with God through Christ, by whom you have received the atonement which reconciles you to God, and makes you understand that in the plenitude of His love He was ready to sacrifice all to win back your affections, to restore your energies, and bring you out of the overweighted burdensomeness of life which receive more burdens than were needful, because of the dark thoughts of God which oppressed and cast gloom over your soul. Here, then, is the principle that the innocent suffer for the guilty. What then shall we say, "Not this man, but Barabbas." Ah! only love is ready to sacrifice itself. Are you who feel sometimes a soaring of love towards Him who loved you ready to endure hardness, ready to suffer for His sake? "Not this man, but Barabbas," but rather the choice will be the other way for us, Christ, and not Barabbas. No interest shall be preferred to this: His supremacy over my soul, give me what Thou wilt of earthly good or gain, but give me Thyself, for Thou art more than all; give me Thyself that I may grow to love Thee, may grow like Thee, and, growing like Thee, may be ready to sacrifice myself for others. I ask not then a temporal good; I ask not ease, nor plenty, nor circumstances which are free from pressure and the disappointments of life; I ask anything which shall take my soul and make it like to the eternal One, the loving One, the pure One. If you choose Christ and not Barabbas, mark you, do choose the cross, for only in the pressure of circumstances is the soul educated, only in the bearing of the cross, and the carrying of the cross after Christ, is the power of Christ revealed in you, therefore it is a choice of pain; but you can choose it because of love's enthusiasm, ready to bear, ready to suffer, because "He loved you, and gave Himself for you." Does not this reconcile you to circumstances which sometimes have tempted you to grumble? Does not this reconcile you to believe that all shall be well, for all is well if spiritual force is daily communicated

to us: all is well if our characters are growing like His, if purity is taking the place of the miserable selfishness, if self-sacrificing love is taking the place of self-indulgence, if resemblance to Christ is taking the place of miserable, selfish material, self-assertive arrogance of disposition which defiles, debases, and degrades.

Hence I would say at the close of this night's service when we are entering upon the week in which the story of our Lord's passion is unfolded to us in the services up to Good Friday, surely the choice is always before us, and surely we who may transport ourselves, by imagination, into the presence of the men of old, can see the two standing there, may in each day's action see the two, self on the one side with its strength of self-assertion, with its powers of indulgence, with its eye eager and greedy of this world's gain, and on the other side Christ pale, poor, but possessed of purity and the love which appeals to all the better and nobler nature within us. Whether of the twain says your fate and destiny, whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? And the answer from the crowd will always be "Barabbas," and the answer from the soul in whom heaven and heavenliness is born will be "Christ," the beginning and the end of the power of life which is alone worth living in this world which is God's.

THE INTROIT OF THE SOUL.

I.—Faith.

By the Rev. S. J. SYKES, B.A., Curate of Lower Mitton, Stourport, Worcestershire.

Sermon Preached at St. Stephen's, South Lambeth, on Sunday Evening, January 24th, 1892.

"I believe."—St. Mark ix. 24.

THE Gospel of the day leads our thought to the subject of Faith. It records a striking utterance of our Lord's, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Spoken, as this was, of an uncircumcised Gentile, it throws light on the relation of saving faith to symbolic ordinance. Let me ask you, therefore, to consider the subject of Faith or Belief, as illustrated in the text.

"I believe." The Church takes up the utterance of this afflicted man, and places it at the head of what—if it be anything at all—is at once the profession of our creed, an act of adoration, a confession of impotence, and the triumphant celebration of our heritage of strength.

Who was this man that troubled the Master, as He descended from the Mount of Transfiguration, from the unspeakable solemnities of that communion with the Father—who was this that dared to disturb so holy a calm with the discord of his small distress? You may remember Raphael's picture—so true to the spirit of the scene, though so far from its reality—with its striking contrast between the majestic harmony upon the mount, where the Figure stands in shining raiment, and the painful display of human passion and failure in the valley below. Who was this intruder upon those who but now witnessed the manifestation of the Godhead, who but now heard the heavenly Voice?

He was "one of the multitude."

Surely here is such a touch as is found only in one Book. Like "the woman that was a sinner," he is nameless, without distinguishing mark of standing or family or nation—only "one of the multitude." But every one in the multitude is a tabernacled soul; and what need to describe the accidents of the tenement that held that wondrous emanation from the Fount of Life? Only "one of the multitude"; but that description suffices the purpose of the All-Father—suffices a message that is to embrace humanity and to leaven the world. If only men and women could learn to distinguish the accidental from the essential features of the man whom God created, how much less heartburning and pettiness, how much less envy and hatred and malice should we see! The Christ never gave a glance to mere accidentals. He saw only the Soul of man and God. To Him the kingdoms of sense, the dynasties of earth, the systems of men, were but flecks upon the horizon of time, which itself was dissolving like a cloud upon the bosom of eternity. The Syrian mountains that He loved to look upon, the Galilean lake, the sunny fields, were to Him but the certain symbol, the transparent veil of the new heavens and the new earth, the true home of humanity.

It was "one of the multitude" who found himself in the presence of forces that he was powerless to control, who was compelled to see them tearing his child as he stood by in his helplessness—one of the multitude who, as he cried out and said with tears, "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief," knew his own weakness, and therein unsealed the springs of his strength.

Consider then this Belief, which to-day, as in that hour, can so lift a man from human weakness by allying him with Divine strength.

You will often find it helpful, in endeavouring to penetrate into the inner meaning of a word, to take its history: to see what it meant when first it was uttered by lips of men: to watch it, as borne down the stream of history, it widens or narrows its meaning: to mark here some conception that maturer knowledge has brought to birth, enriching its connotation; there the cramping limitations of some prejudice contracting its breadth. There are, perhaps, few words in our language which more fully repay this method of study than does the word "believe." It has a noble ancestry.*

* I am indebted to Professor Max Müller's "Lectures on the Science of Language" for the steps in the history of this word.

In the great Aryan language, the common ancestor of nearly all European languages, which carries us back to a far antiquity, we find its root. And what did this root mean with those who first framed it? What was the conception they desired to express? This: a strong overruling dominant passion, which will take the hearts of men in bondage and subjugate them and sway them, as the gale will take the giant trees of the forest and bend them, or passing to the sea will rock some mighty vessel in the cradle of its rude imperious surge. An irresistible impulse that sweeps like a tempest over men—such was the first meaning. The next stage shows a degradation of this noble idea. The word reappears in the Latin tongue, but with a much contracted sense. It is still an overruling passion, but only with a bad signification. An illicit lust; the strong, evil power of attraction often exercised by one human being over another; this is all that the Roman "libido" made of that first majestic conception. The next step (through modern German) still further reduces the strength left the word in the Latin, and "belieben" simply means "to approve." So the word comes down to us, and in English we have given it two meanings. For the one, we have finally stripped it of all its original power, so that "I believe so" may be degraded to mean nothing more than "I suppose so." But (to our credit be it said) we have also lifted it back to its old high place: we have restored to it the majesty of its Aryan days; we have given to it to denote that irresistible impulse, which ends in the highest act of union between creature and Creator.

I have been thus at pains to exhibit the history of this word in order that I may ask one question. When we take up these most solemn words which the Holy Church puts upon our lips, and with outward show of reverence, as is becoming, say: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord. . . . . I believe in the Holy Ghost," in which of these two senses do we use the word "believe." Christianity has shown us Faith as that sweeping tempestuous force in men's lives which the Aryans of old sought to express; and the genius of our language has clothed that idea in the word, whose far-away root was fashioned to express it. Is that impulse real in our own lives? Do we take up the word as it came down to us with its glorious heritage of strength to mean a new principle of life in us? Or does it denote a mere acquiescence in what we are fain to accept as an opinion sanctioned by respectability? Are we sure that it is not a matter of congratulation in our secret thought, that we are separated by so respectable an interval as nearly nineteen centuries from the Despised and Rejected of men, the Carpenter's Son? If that be so, we have not entered into the outer courts of that temple of Faith, before whose innermost shrine St. Paul and St. Stephen and the noble army of Martyrs gloried to die.

Look for one moment at the contrast between the suggestions of intellect or Reason, and the impulse of this Faith. "Reason" (I quote Mr. Froude), "says that on the whole Truth and Justice are desirable things. They make men happier in themselves, and they make society more prosperous. But there Reason ends, and men will not die for mere principles of utility. But Faith says that between truth and lies there is an infinite distance: one is of God, the other of Satan: one is eternally to be loved, the other eternally to be abhorred. It cannot say why, in language intelligible to reason. . . . . It is the voice of the nobler nature in man speaking out of his heart." And in obedience to that voice men will be content, men have been content to bind upon their brows the martyr's crown to symbolise the sovereignty of Truth. Such is Faith.

There is the true ring of Faith in Martin Luther's answer, when his friends urged him not to go to the city where the powerful council, headed by the Emperor, were waiting to compass his destruction. "I would go," he said, "were there as many devils awaiting me as there are tiles to the housetops." He trembled, for he was human; but he went, because he *believed*.

Faith, of which the test is conduct, is the receiving of the truth. It is one chord in the introit of the soul—its chant of adoration and the fervent breathing of its prayer as it passes to its most holy feast upon the mystical Body and Blood. Without faith there is no reception of that Heavenly Food. Where true faith is, not even the consecrated sacramental element can raise it to an holier efficacy. It is a profound rubric in the Service for the Communion of the Sick which concerns those cases where, for some reason, the elements cannot be administered to the dying. The old Sarum Manual, with a beautiful simplicity, here directed the priest to say, "Brother, in this case true faith and a good will suffice. Believe only, *and thou hast eaten*."

I once heard a little parable which comes back to me in this connection. In the street of a large town a daisy, sprung from some chance seed, grew between two stones of the pavement. When the sun went down it folded its petals against the dark: soon the lamp hard by was lighted, but the daisy did not know its rays: stars shining above, silent preachers of beauty, flung their faint influence over the flower, but still it answered not: presently the moon bathed the daisy with silver light, but the petals were folded still. Till the dawn the daisy slept—till the first rays of the sun touched the little flower. And it knew that touch and awoke at once, and opened its petals to drink in warmth, and light, and life.

So there are instincts of the soul which intellect cannot satisfy, which mere emotion cannot feed, which the human will cannot control; for they throb only to the touch of God. And when they feel the

quickening energy of their Creator, like the flower in the sunlight, they answer; and by the highest act of Faith they pulsate to the influences of that energy, from it to receive new sustenance, and strength, and life.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 28, 1892.

DECENT PICTURES.

"DOING the galleries" is a regular duty of the season. Whether people care more now for pictures than they did fifty years ago is doubtful, but there is no doubt that they spend more time and money over them; one picture by an eminent artist is to-day quite as valuable for exhibition purposes as the entire stock-in-trade of a circus. *Chacun à son gout* in these as in other matters. We, however, regret to notice that, though the picture-show is the most profitable, it is the least proper. It is not safe to prophesy in these days; there is no telling what we may come to, and the forms and scenes we see depicted on canvas may yet be part of our daily life and conversation, climate and weather permitting; but is it too much to ask our painters to wait till that consummation has arrived? We have not yet dispensed with tailors—even at drawing-rooms we must dress, though the artists don't see the necessity.

The artist is more independent than he was, because he is better paid. He has got the advantage of the public, because fashion demands that we must see his pictures; and he is using his strength like a giant. It ought to be his vocation to show us ourselves as others see us; he insists upon representing us as we hope and trust nobody ever did see us, except when we were babies and happily unconscious. When, oh when, will he hold his hand?

"To the pure all ——" we hear him beginning to snuffle. Yes, that is true, but it is not the same as "to the pure all impure things are pure," which is very much what his defence comes to. The rage for the representation of, let us say the "undraped" has almost become a mania; artists have got to believe that there is no art without it, and the "undraped" model is now intruded into every scene and subject—even what ought to be most reverend, *teste* Mr. Calderon's St. Elizabeth. The public don't like it, but they have to stand it—for the nonce the artists are our masters. Put a beggar on horseback and we all know where he will ride; but once make a man R.A., and there is no saying what will become of him, and us.

Perhaps it was well for painting (N.B.—Painters call it Art, with the distinct insinuation that Art is nothing else)—perhaps it was well for painting to be freed from trammels; but liberty and license are not quite the same thing. We know all the conventionalities about faithfulness and truth in the painter's art, the development of the ideal, and all that sort of thing. Is there anything ideal about a model? You will find ideals in Mr. Watts' sublime allegories, but you will look in vain for them in most of the pictures which we vainly strive to divert the attention of our daughters from when we go to picture galleries. There lies the rub. Given a picture of lofty conception, a thing of beauty and instruction and recreation, evolved out of the heart of a great genius, and *les convénances* are of small account. But where there is no lofty conception, where a man has simply used his well-trained fingers to paint a living model, neither better nor worse than life, filling in a few lay-figures and writing underneath a title filched from familiar history or fable, or from a more questionable source, then there is no excuse. He need not have done it, he would perhaps have more faithfully represented his subject if he had not done it. He has simply tried to familiarise us with the outlines of a person "undraped" whom, even "draped" we should not wish to be acquainted with. And he only makes the offence worse by pressing into his defence certain "forms of sound words" like those we have quoted, which he uses without reverence, and, worse still, without intelligence. If painters must draw their arguments from the great Apostle, we would recommend to them another of his remarks: "All things are lawful for me; but all things are not expedient." It is not expedient for us to have all around the sort of pictures which at present afflict us. Surely the artist has had law enough; he might now restrict himself a little out of consideration for others. We imagine that by this time his model has been represented in almost every way to him conceivable; may we suggest a new one, and ask him to paint her—dressed?

Miss Eleanor S. Wigram, daughter of the honorary secretary of the Church Missionary Society, has been accepted for missionary service.

ARCHDEACON F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

By the Rev. THEODORE L. CUYLER, D.D.

Since the death of Canon Liddon, the most popular preacher in the Established Church of England is Archdeacon Farrar. Certainly, none attracts so many of our countrymen around his pulpit. He has always been a favourite writer among our American people, and when he visited America in 1885, he received an enthusiastic welcome. He once said to me, "I receive more hearty expressions of personal kindness from Americans of all denominations than from the members of my own church here in England." His funeral oration on President Grant, delivered in Westminster Abbey, was received with great favour on this side of the Atlantic.

Dr. Frederick W. Farrar, like Thackeray, the novelist, is a native of India, and was born at Bombay on August 7, 1831. He came early in life to England, was graduated from King's College in London, and then became a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge—that remarkable hive of genius which bears the most splendid muster-roll of any college in Great Britain. He won several prizes, and soon after leaving Cambridge he became Assistant-Master of Harrow School with Dr. Vaughan. In 1871 he was chosen Head-Master of Marlborough College, whence he came to London as Canon of Westminster. Six years ago he was made Archdeacon of Westminster, and is the rector of the parish of St. Margaret, in which church he preaches every Sunday. Why a man of his superb powers and scholarship has never been made a bishop may puzzle those who do not know that in Britain the mitre—like the Presidency in America—does not always alight on the loftiest heads. Dr. Farrar is too "liberal" in his theology to suit the Low Church, and too radical in his politics to suit the High Church. He is a decided Broad Churchman, with very pronounced Evangelical views on most points (as his "Life of St. Paul" clearly indicates); but his writings on Eschatology lean towards Universal Restorationism. He was Bampton Lecturer at Oxford in 1885.

In prolific authorship Dr. Farrar is one of the marvels of the age. How he is able to perform the mere mechanical labour of consulting so many authorities, mastering so many authors, and composing so many elaborate works is a mystery. He has produced over twenty volumes, some of them requiring vast research, in addition to a large number of contributions to encyclopædias, reviews, and theological periodicals. And all the time he is preparing powerful sermons for his St. Margaret's pulpit, and often addresses temperance and other philanthropic meetings from the platform. No man could achieve such prodigies unless he were a miser of his minutes and a "terrible toiler." The last time that I called on him at his pleasant residence in Westminster Yard, I found him standing at a high desk with his study-jacket on. Like many other great students, he does much of his work on his legs, and walks about to consult his various authorities. For ten months of every year he toils like a galley-slave, and turns off his manuscripts with great rapidity; then he locks up his library and runs away to the mountains of Wales for his annual vacation. The English climate is favourable to hard work, bodily or mental; and, in addition to this, Dr. Farrar is possessed of a cast-iron constitution, and is very observant of the laws of health.

The first book that made him famous was his "Life of Christ." It ran through twelve editions during the first year, and its sale in Britain has been enormous. In America it has been reprinted in every variety of style—in handsome editions for the rich, and cheap editions for the poor. The majority of all our ministers own it in some shape; and I am free to confess that during the first few years after its appearance it was one of the best-thumbed volumes in my library. I often took it up for the enjoyment of its style, in which the rich musical cadences of a poem mingle with the researches of historical scholarship. In spite of all its faults, it seems to my mind the most perfect portraiture of the Man Christ Jesus that has been produced outside of the inspired Gospels. His "Life of St. Paul" is a masterpiece of brilliant writing and large erudition; many of his great descriptive passages have the gorgeousness of Lord Macaulay. The next production of his busy pen, entitled "The Early Days of Christianity," is crammed with learning, but its turgid rhetoric often runs into bombast. His latest work, the "Lives of the Fathers," is a return to his earlier and more chaste and temperate style.

As a preacher Dr. Farrar stands in the highest rank of living British clergymen. He has none of the graces of oratory, or fascinations of voice such as Mr. Spurgeon possessed. His discourses are carefully written, and read in a fervid, earnest, and manly fashion. In physique he is a sturdy Englishman with a broad brow, a keen eye, and a voice of sufficient volume to be fairly heard when he preaches in Westminster Abbey. Some of his discourses are rather florid in style; but when he is handling some question of practical duty or social reform he hurls out his fearless denunciations with the precision and the power of a Gatling gun. There is no preacher in England to-day who has more of the courage of his convictions than Dr. Farrar. It is this uncompromising plainness of speech which has made him unpopular in polite and perfumed circles of society, and has probably been a bar to his ecclesiastical promotion.

In practical philanthropy he has been intensely active ever since he came to London. He was the founder of the Westminster Sunday School Association, and has a helping hand for almost every enterprise of local reform. Several years ago he adopted the principles and practice of total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages, and threw himself into that movement with all his might and main. Dr. Farrar is really the most brilliant and effective advocate of the total abstinence reform now living. His addresses entitled "Between the Living and the Dead," "The Serpent and the Tiger," and "Abstinence for the Sake of Ourselves and Others" are powerful specimens of argument clothed in most vivid and impassioned rhetoric. Most of his temperance orations have been reprinted in America by the National Temperance Society, and they welcomed him with a public reception when he visited New York. His trenchant and courageous style makes him a favourite speaker to collegians, and after his address on "Teetotalism" before the University of Edinburgh the students escorted him to the railway station, and sent him away with "three times three cheers and a tiger."

Nearly twenty years ago Dr. Farrar published his first volume of sermons, entitled "The Silence and he Voices of God." They were delivered at Cam-

bridge University, Hereford Cathedral, and other conspicuous places; and some of them have a solemn directness and pungency of appeal that Mr. Spurgeon might have employed. The one, entitled "Too Late," is such a note of arousing alarm as the most evangelical pastor might sound in the height of a revival season. They are models of fervour, force, and godly fidelity. In a solemn appeal to the students of Cambridge he said, "You can find rest, peace, and purity in Christ, and find it nowhere else. You can find it in the religion which Christ came to teach; the sunrise of its first day flushed over the manger of Bethlehem, and the sunset of its last will fall red upon the cross of Calvary!" Distant be the day when the voice of this faithful preacher and fearless reformer shall no longer echo over Britain and the world.—*The Christian Age.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION.

SIR,—I observe that the conceptions brought forward by "Vindex" differ in a material degree from mine. I am at present away from home, and cannot reply fully to his remarks in Saturday's PULPIT.

As he again refers to dogs, I may say that I have often viewed with wonder and admiration the proofs of intelligence manifested by those interesting animals, and have even been moved to tenderness by tokens of fidelity and attachment I have witnessed, sometimes attended by self-sacrifice. But I think the higher grades of intelligence are not within the capacity of any of their race. I have never found reason to suppose that the most elevated canine faculties could ascend to the conception of a Divine Being, or be influenced by moral principles. Man may be said to be the god of the dog, and he knows no other. In the sense I am using the term "intelligent beings," I do not include dogs.

According to my mode of thinking, if certain texts "establish the grand purpose of God to bestow immortality and a loving union with Himself on all the race of Adam," then we may legitimately and rationally declare that "immortality has been conferred, and will be sustained." I hold that every purpose of God will be fulfilled, and none can or will be frustrated. I moreover cherish the firm and consolatory belief, that whatever our mental faculties can imagine, that would be really good for the intelligent universe, will be effected; and whatever is really injurious will be remedied and removed. I therefore naturally and unavoidably reject with abhorrence the idea of endless sin and misery. It is also revolting to my moral consciousness to suppose that any wise, energetic, and holy beings can exist within reach of sin and suffering, without striving earnestly to change the scene entirely, so that all may be as happy as themselves. That is my conception of the work of heaven, and the purpose for which some are elected and have special influences and privileges, fitting them to become blessings to others in the widest sense.

If I understand "Vindex" correctly, he is able to contemplate with serenity, as a final result of the Scheme of Redemption, the prospect that "some will be destroyed, body and soul, in hell, in an everlasting destruction; while others will be united to Christ, and will have a joyful immortality." At the same time he finds it intolerable to believe that *all* will be united to Christ, although in the case of a large proportion incalculable ages of acute disciplinary suffering will intervene, that is to say, very protracted and of shorter duration—"many stripes, few stripes"—never more than is necessary. Surely an immortality of holiness and happiness, even after millions of ages of suffering, is far preferable to remediless ruin, whether it takes the shape of endless painful consciousness or complete extinction of consciousness, which I call annihilation!

In my letter to the PULPIT which appeared on 12th March, I endeavour to show what I believe to be the wise and loving purposes of election and special privileges; not narrow and partial, but working out universal blessings. I do not rejoice because vast multitudes are suffering, have been suffering, and will continue to suffer; but I rejoice greatly, because it seems clear to me, from the declarations of Scripture, that all will be made holy and happy at last.

It is delightful for me to believe that I live and move and have my being in God, and that I am dependent every moment of existence on the Divine presence and energy. But I can see that the fact of that unceasing absolute dependence renders it difficult to make me a free agent. I may add, in the words of Locke, "I see not the way of it." The lengthened discussions on the question of freedom or necessity have, as far as I am aware, never led to any decisive result.

It appears, I think, to be clearly shown that some of the earliest Christian writers, whose mother-tongue was the same as that in which the Apostles wrote, did not understand *aiôn* and *aiônias* to mean *endless*. The Bishop of Manchester, in the "Teaching of Christ," says we must give up the idea of *endlessness* as being the meaning of those words in any case.

Canonbury, May 23rd, 1892. J. B.

THE London correspondent of the *Bucks Herald* says that throughout Buckinghamshire will be but one feeling of deep regret that, after two years of serious illness, the Dean of Lichfield has felt himself bound to resign, and to retire from a long and successful career of devoted labour. When Bishop Wilberforce found the county of Buckingham taken from the diocese of Lincoln and added to that of Oxford, he naturally looked out for a lieutenant who would weld into a harmonious whole the counties of Oxford, Berks, and Bucks. He found such a one in the person of Mr. Bickersteth, who, while fulfilling admirably the duties of vicar of Aylesbury, was ubiquitous throughout the county.

THERE was a very well-attended and hearty meeting held in the Hall of Exeter College in support of the Oxford House in Bethnal Green. The speakers were Lord Cranbrook, Mr. Ingram (the head of the house), and the Dean of Christ Church. The year is an eventful one in the history of the house, for in June the handsome new house, designed by Sir A. Blomfield, will be formally opened by the Duke of Connaught and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and in September will be regularly taken possession of by its new inmates. It is to be hoped that the new house will be found by many generations of Oxford men a more comfortable house and as useful and fruitful a centre of work as the old house has proved in the years over

which its history has extended. Those who know Mr. Ingram will be sure that in his hands it will not fail—at any rate from any want of judgment, or energy, or well-schooled enthusiasm.

THE report of the Curators of the Bodleian Library, which has just been issued, contains but little that calls for remark or comment. The Librarian seems still to pride himself unduly rather on the quantity than the quality of the additions made to the library in the course of the year; but some acquisitions of value have been received. The two most important and interesting additions are a Zend MS. of the Yasma, with Pahlavi translation, and a volume of Anglo-Saxon Charters purchased by the library for £220 10s. Besides these two, one other interesting fragment of great antiquity has been received. The vicar and churchwardens of Dymock, Gloucester, have presented a leaf which formed part of the binding of a parish register, containing a fragment of St. John's Gospel in the Vulgate. "This leaf is in beautiful Hiberno-Saxon half-uncial characters of the ninth century, with an occasional mixture of Continental uncial forms in common words, tending to show that the MS. was written in England. It is apparently the oldest specimen of Hiberno-Saxon writing in the library."

ON Monday last a meeting was held in the Guildhall, Cambridge, under the auspices of the Cambridge University Church Defence Society, to consider the position and progress of the Church in Wales. Professor Jebb, M.P., presided, and said that those who listened to the discussion in Parliament on Welsh disestablishment with unbiassed minds could not fail to apprehend that whilst the case of the assailants was miserably weak, the case in favour of the Church in Wales was supported by arguments of unanswerable strength. The majority which decided in favour of the cause of the Church in Wales was such as to demonstrate that the attack, instead of gaining, had lost ground since it was last delivered. For the present that was, no doubt, an eminently satisfactory result, but it would be a result almost to be regretted if it tended in any degree to diminish the vigilance and the activity with which the defenders of the Church were bound to protect it. Nothing was more important at the present time than that accurate knowledge respecting the past and present history of the Welsh Church, and of its present circumstances, should be diffused as widely as possible throughout Britain. (Cheers.)

The Bishop of St. Asaph said the question of disestablishment and disendowment in Wales called for special and general treatment. The advocates of disestablishment in Wales rested their case against the Church upon circumstances which they described as special and peculiar to that Church. Those opposed to disestablishment were prepared to challenge the accuracy of that description. But he thought he might go further and say that as Churchmen they declined to admit that, even if those special circumstances existed in such a measure as they were said to exist, the case of the Welsh Church could be settled independently of its bearing upon the great question of disestablishment of the Church in England. The Church in Wales alone had saved Wales from the blight of secularism in their elementary schools, and occupied the position of sole defender of the faith in the realm of education. Welsh Nonconformity failed to provide a resident pastorate in rural districts, and there were ninety parishes in his diocese without a single Nonconformist minister. The ruling thought and desire of the Liberationists was disendowment; but instead of the Church in Wales being enormously rich, as Liberationists thought, she was so poor as to be scarcely worth plundering. The main danger of the Church in Wales at the present time was this, not that it was weaker than the Church in England, but he was rather afraid that English Churchmen might think the matter was so small that it was scarcely worth troubling about.

Mr. Boscawen delivered a telling speech in support of the Bishop's address.

Mr. Raikes traversed the statement that it was the people of Wales who wanted disestablishment. Those who wanted disestablishment were the politicians, the press, and the preachers.

Professor Ryle, in proposing a vote of thanks to the speakers, testified that the Church in Wales was going forward by leaps and bounds, whilst amongst those who would destroy the Church there was quarrelling and dissension.

The Rev. J. J. Lias seconded. As a minister for twelve years in the Welsh Church, he could testify to the accuracy of the facts that had been brought under their notice.

The proposition was carried, and acknowledged by his Lordship.

On the motion of the Rev. F. H. Chase, seconded by Dr. Campbell, a vote of thanks was given to the chairman, and the proceedings terminated.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Auber, Rev. Robert Charles St. Lo; Vicar of Baulking-with-Woolstone, Berks.
Back, Rev. Hugh C. A., M.A., Senior Curate of Kidderminster; Vicar of Haveringland-with-Brandeston, near Norwich.
Brown, Rev. James Edward, B.A.; Rector of Stockpool-Elidor, Pembroke; Vicar of Oldbury, Worcestershire.
Bryant, Rev. William, B.A.; Vicar of Stoke Lyne-with-Coversfield and Fewcot, Oxon.
Buckland, Rev. Arthur R., Assistant-Diocesan Inspector, Rochester; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for Herts and Rural Deanery of Barking.
Bullock, Rev. R. G. P., M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Sheepscar, Leeds; Perpetual Curate of St. Martin's, Potternewton, Leeds.
Burton, Rev. Henry Darwin, Curate of Carshalton; Missioner in the diocese of St. Albans.
Burton, Rev. Roger Taylor, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the diocese of Carlisle.
Davies, Rev. David, B.A.; Vicar of Llangennech, Carmarthenshire.
Davis, Rev. David Grimaldi, M.A., Vicar of Welshpool; Rural Dean.
Donne, the Venerable Archdeacon, M.A., Vicar of Wakefield; Surrogate for the diocese of Wakefield.
Draper, Rev. John, M.A., Curate; Vicar of St. Paul's, Bethnal-green.
Dundas, Rev. Leland Bowen; Vicar of Treneglos, Cornwall.
Edwards, Rev. Daniel; Vicar of Rhyl.
Griffiths, Rev. William Henry, Rector of Maidstone, Salop; Vicar of St. Peter's, Clerkenwell.
Gunyon, Rev. William H., Incumbent of West Stockwith, Gainsborough; Vicar of Oxhenhope, Keighley.
Hartley, Rev. Rathbone, Curate of Rochdale; Curate-in-Charge of All Souls' Mission district, in the parish of St. Martin's, Castleton Moor, Rochdale.
Hatton, Rev. James W., M.A., Vicar of Calverley, Leeds; Vicar of Knowle, Warwickshire.
Hunter, Rev. Henry C. F.; Chaplain to the *Royal Sovereign*.
Hurrell, Rev. Swann; East London Clergyman.
Jones, Rev. Joshua; Rector of Llangower, Bala.

Langley, Rev. N. T., Vicar of St. John the Evangelist, West Bromwich ; Surrogate for the diocese of Lichfield.
Lucey, Rev. Algernon Charles, M.A., Curate of St. James's, Norlands ; Vicar of Emmanuel Parish, Camberwell, S.E.
Marris, Rev. Nisbet C., M.A., Senior Curate of Horncastle ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Oswald's, Crowle, Doncaster.
Norman, Rev. William Haswell, M.A. ; Permission to officiate in the diocese of Peterborough.
Norman, Rev. Samuel James, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Brighton ; Rector of Merston, Sussex.
Oxland, Rev. William, Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Ganges*.
Potter, Rev. J. Hasloch, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Upper Tooting ; Rural Dean of Streatham.
Purnell, Rev. R. H. W., B.A., Curate ; Vicar of Staverton-cum-Boddington, Gloucestershire.
Rackham, Rev. Richard B., M.A., Curate of Great Budworth, Northwich ; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Chester.
Randolph, Rev. Edward Foyle, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Blackheath ; Vicar of Mendlesham, Suffolk.
Ripley, Rev. R. J., Curate ; Rector of the Parish Church, St. Ann's Bay, Jamaica.
Roberts, Rev. Hugh, Vicar of Brymbo ; Canon of David-ap-Howell in St. Asaph Cathedral.
Robertson, Rev. Archibald, M.A., Principal of Hatfield Hall, Durham ; Hon. Secretary of the Waifs and Strays Society for the Durham diocese.
Roderick, Rev. E. M., M.A., Vicar of Mold ; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Asaph.
Rogers, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Accrington ; Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral, and Rural Dean of Whalley.
Royds, Rev. F. C., M.A., Rector of Coddington ; Rural Dean of Malpas.
Rugg, Rev. H. H. ; Vicar of Christ Church, Brockham-green, Surrey.
Sargeaunt, Rev. William Drake, B.A. ; Vicar of Bozeat-cum-Strixton, Wellingborough.
Snell, Rev. H. W. ; Vicar of All Saints', Blackheath.
Stüppell, Rev. George Michaëlis ; East London Clergyman.
Sunderland, Rev. James, M.A., LL.M., Vicar of Egginton, near Leighton Buzzard ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Bedfordshire.
Thomas, Ven. Archdeacon D. R., M.A. ; Rector of Llandrinio, Oswestry.
Walter, Rev. David, M.A., Curate of Emmanuel Church, Leeds ; Vicar of Grinton, Yorkshire.
Walters, Ven. William, M.A., Archdeacon of Worcester and Vicar of Pershore ; Rector of Barnard's Castle, Ludlow.
Webb, Rev. Arthur, M.A. ; Chaplain to the Exeter Grammar-school.
Wild, Rev. E. J. ; Rector of Rattlesden, Suffolk.
Wilder, Rev. W. B. C. ; Rector of Great Bradley, Suffolk.
Wilkinson, Rev. John Hessay, late Rector of Christon, Somerset ; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Exeter.
Williams, Rev. Alan, B.A. ; Chaplain to the Mersey Missions to Seamen.
Williams, Rev. Edmund Nelson Goddard, M.A. ; Rector of Howell, Sleaford.
Williams, Rev. Frederick Mackenzie, Vicar of Knowbury, Ludlow ; Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral.
Wilson, Rev. George Martin ; Public Preacher in the diocese of Exeter.
Wilson, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Stoke Bruerne ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Northamptonshire.
Wood, Rev. Ernest E., Curate of Harrow, Middlesex ; Vicar of Lathom, St. James, Ormskirk.
Yule, Rev. Charles John Francis, M.A. ; Vicar of Ashbury, Berks.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Dawson, Rev. W. Alfred, M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge, formerly Vicar of Flitwick, Beds, at Calais, France, on the 10th inst., aged 83.
Smith, Rev. George Edward, Vicar, at Owston Vicarage, Lincolnshire, on the 19th inst., aged 67.
Steward, Rev. F., J.P., for fifty-six years Rector of the parish of Barking and Darmsden, and for forty years Chairman of the Bosmere and Claydon Union, at the Rectory, on the 19th inst., aged 86.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following :—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE BLESSING OF THE TRIUNE GOD.

By the Rev. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A.

Sermon Preached at St. Andrew's Church, Walcot, Bath, on Trinity Sunday, May 24th, 1891.

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, 'Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord (Jehovah) bless thee and keep thee; the Lord (Jehovah) make His face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee: the Lord (Jehovah) lift up His countenance upon thee and give thee peace. And they shall put My name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them."—Numbers vi. 22-27.

WHERE we least expect to meet God there often we find Him. When Israel went out of Egypt, the cities of that country and of the world were full of gods and of idols; but Jehovah was found in a waste land, not inhabited. In the knowledge and worship of the self-revealed God of Love the solitary place was glad, and the wilderness blossomed as the rose. Sacramental signs and pledges—the living stream from the smitten rock, the manna from above—the raiment also that waxed not old, the fiery cloudy pillar, the divine ritual of the tabernacle, "prompted with remembrance of a present God." And particularly in the blessing which concluded the sacrificial services (Lev. ix. 22) would the faithful Israelite realize the presence of Jehovah in the fulness of His favour. The fourfold duty of Aaron and his sons was to sanctify the holy things, to burn incense before the Lord, to minister unto Him, and to bless in His name for ever (1 Chron. xxiii. 13). The blessing in God's name was, indeed, a chief part of the priest's duty. Thereby every Israelite in the camp was assured of his interest in the mercy and goodness of Jehovah. Thereby it was declared that "salvation belongeth unto the Lord," because "His blessing was upon His people." Even the form which the blessing was to take is given, and therein we see an individual distribution of grace and love by the triune God Himself through His ministers. It is true the words of blessing are uttered by them, for the precept runs thus, "Ye shall bless the children of Israel." But this blessing is no wishing of good luck as between man and man. It is a divine deed of gift to the heirs of faith; it is the word of Him who speaks and it is done, who commandeth and it stands fast. God's blessing is the command of Omnipotence. (See Lev. xxv. 21). "He hath blessed," exclaims Balaam, after vainly striving to change the voice of God, "and I cannot reverse it" (Num. xxiii. 20).

I. The general character of God's blessing may be gathered from other texts of Scripture. It is "the blessing of the Lord" that "maketh rich," the wise man tells us—rich, not necessarily in the possession of earthly wealth, but assuredly in the possession of that righteousness which cometh from the God of our salvation (Ps. xxiv. 5), and of that life eternal that never dies. For "the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore" (Ps. cxxxiii. 3). And the beginning of this blessing is in the forgiveness of sins, which brings us into communion with God. For the Resurrection message is that God sent His Son "to bless you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities" (Acts iii. 26).

But notice, the blessing is in Jehovah's name. The name of Jehovah is something more than a verbal title. It is the setting forth of Himself, and when the blessing is given in His name, it is with the stamp of His own character and the seal of His own covenant. Here is God's own recital of His name, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth" (Exod. xxxiv. 6). It comes to us in a personal revelation of the unseen God, for thus does He make known to Moses the angel of His presence, "My name is in him" (Exod. xxiii. 21). Moreover, the name of God implies the glorious covenant of His grace made in Christ—the covenant that is "ordered in all things and sure." For therein Christ hath fulfilled all righteousness, settled all debt of sin, made a way back into God's presence, and opened heaven to all believers. Well may we pray, therefore, in our Lord's own words, "Hallowed be Thy name."

II. But turn now to the particular aspects of Jehovah's blessing as set forth in our text. The name Jehovah is three times used in the blessing, and each time with a different accent in the original Hebrew. The Jews themselves see in this a mystery, and Christian commentators agree in explaining that mystery of the Holy Trinity. And this is how the doctrine always comes before us in the New Testament as a truth to be experienced rather than discussed, for the comfort of the heart rather than for the speculations of theology.

(1.) Let us notice the covenant care promised in the blessing, "The Lord bless thee and keep thee." It is God the Father offering and assuring protection to His people. This is ever the special blessing made known in the Old Testament, though it comes before us also in the New. Sin had exposed mankind to wrath and punishment, bringing back into our world a far darker and more terrible chaos than that out of which it originally sprang. Disease and death in a thousand forms, by inward ravages and outward mischance, followed in the train of sin. The order of things, both natural and moral

and spiritual, was dislocated altogether, and man lived under the apprehension of imminent ruin. His sense of nakedness was not confined to want of clothing, for he felt in the cold loneliness in which the want of divine communion left him his "looped and windowed raggedness" of spirit. But poor sinful man was not utterly forsaken. The echoes of that communion had scarcely died away when the voice of promise is heard, and the plan of divine redemption is made known. Sacrifice shall cover sin. The sinner shall be hidden under the altar. And thus age after age does Jehovah appear out of His holy place, intimating to His people the way of pardon, and pointing to Himself as their hiding-place. Amid a wild world of waters where reigns the silence of death Noah rides in triumph, shut in the ark of salvation by God Himself. "I am thy shield," says Jehovah to His servant, Abraham, and in after ages the same truth is found in the experience of God's chosen people. Nor is this protection limited in its character. He that finds a hiding-place for sinners from their sin, finds also a sure defence for them in the midst of all the ills and adversities of this present world. Trouble may come upon us, but no evil. The terror by night shall not make us afraid, nor the arrow by day alarm our confidence. The angels are charged to keep the saints in safety, and God Himself declares that "he that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty" (Ps. xci. 1). Whether it be dangers that may happen to the body, or evil thoughts that may assault and hurt the soul, we well know that we are in God's hand, and none is able to pluck us thence. For the prayer of our great High Priest stands for ever sure, answered as it is in the experience of every child of God, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me . . . . keep them from evil" (John xvii. 11, 15).

This covenant care is, as we have seen, the special blessing of the Old Testament Scriptures, but when we come to consider the second part of the blessing we shall find God still nearer to us in the person of His dear Son.

(2.) "The Lord make His face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee." Here is the twofold work of Christ set forth, for "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John i. 17). Here is the answer to the prayer of the Psalmist, "Make Thy face to shine upon Thy servant, and teach me Thy statutes" (Ps. cxix. 135). In many parts and many ways did God speak in time past unto the fathers, but in these last days He has spoken unto us by His Son (Heb. i. 1, 2). The light of Christ's countenance is the revelation of eternal truth. In Him we know the truth about ourselves: in Him we know the truth about God. He is indeed the embodiment of the truth, and by Him alone we have access unto the Father. He reveals all things as they are, for that is the meaning of truth; and chiefly He casts light on sin and its attendant evils, displaying at the same time in Himself the means whereby we may return to God, and become partakers of the divine nature. Thus our text points to the Lord Jesus Christ as our Prophet, Priest, and King. And let us notice that this revelation of grace is a personal one, "The Lord make His face to shine upon thee." Divine truth is no mere book-philosophy or doctrine of schools. It is the friendly and familiar converse of the Son of God. He has spoken to us as a man speaketh to his friend—face to face. The message of truth has come from His lips of love. Deeds and miracles of mercy have commended the divine teaching. Christ has preached and taught—Himself. And can you, my brethren, as you read the story of His life on earth, utter for yourselves the testimony of the Apostle Paul, "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ?" (2 Cor. iv. 6). For let me say that always as here, grace and truth are in union. In Christ "mercy and truth have met together." You cannot know the truth as it is in Jesus without the grace of God to reveal it to your hearts. And the Lord Christ deals graciously with every returning sinner. He waiteth to be gracious to the penitent heart. Truth without grace would be to us like the light of the sun without its life-giving heat. The face of Jesus in all its brightness and beauty of holiness only expresses the love of His heart. Gracious words proceeded out of His mouth when He spake on earth, and gracious thoughts flow from His heart now that He reigns as King in heaven. Have you then, my brethren, to use the Apostle Peter's words, "tasted that the Lord is gracious?" Jesus has grace in Himself for all that come unto God by Him. "The grace (or favour) of God was upon Him" we read in the story of His earthly life, when He stooped to creaturehood for us. Nay more, it was grace that caused this amazing condescension. "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich" (2 Cor. viii. 9). Thus divine grace was seen in Christ, both as God and man, and that free favour of God to all His creatures comes in endless measure to us in Christ. Only sin and unbelief can check its outflow, and only in Christ can we find it restored to sinners. Begin then at once, dear brethren, if you have not begun already, to acquaint yourselves with the gracious character of our blessed Saviour and Lord. Yea, "take with you words and turn to the Lord: say unto Him, Take away all iniquity and receive us graciously; so will we render the praises of our lips" (Hos. xiv. 2). And let this be only the beginning of good things; yea, it can only be this if you are truly forgiven; for you will follow on to know the Lord and to grow like Him, receiving ever of His fulness and grace for grace.

(3.) The last part of the blessing consists of guidance, prosperity, and peace. "The Lord lift up His countenance upon you, and give you peace." This surely points to the work of the Holy Spirit, who is given to all them that yield to God the obedience of faith. The world is saying now as of old, "Who will show us any good?" And in our text the Psalmist's prayer is answered, "Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us" (Ps. iv. 6). The work of the Son of God ensures to His people the continual indwelling of the Holy Spirit. That Spirit comes to us in virtue of Christ's mediatorial office. "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." He guides us into all the truth of Christ according to our needs and desires; He teaches us how to pray as we ought, making intercession for us according to the will of God. He sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts, and gives that hope in Christ that maketh not ashamed. In trouble He is our Consoler; in difficulty and perplexity we may depend upon the direction of His Word as brought home to our hearts by Him; in temptation He keeps us near to Christ; in duty He gives us spiritual power; and through all our earthly life He is the Earnest and Firstfruits of our final inheritance in the kingdom of God. Thus we can "praise God for the help of His countenance," and thus do we find therein "the peace of God which passeth all understanding." By the Holy Spirit's teaching we are first, as weary, heavy-laden sinners, brought into peace with God through the blood of Christ. That blessed Comforter brings us back to the great reconciliation when sin makes us conscious of having wandered from it, and, as we come to know more of the grace of Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, the peace of God more and more rules in our hearts, and we learn the preciousness of God's gift of peace. Accept then, my brethren, the blessing of the triune God. His covenant care, His truth and grace, His joy and peace are yours in Christ. Appropriate them by faith, and know of a surety that in them you have a possession all and always your own. "For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of My peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee" (Isa. liv 10).

THE rural deaneries of Hampshire have been rearranged by the Bishop of the diocese. Among other alterations the parishes of Avington, Easton, and King's Worthy are transferred from the Alresford Deanery to that of Winchester. Instead of three deaneries being the respective titles of Andover North, Andover West, and Andover South, there will be but one deanery of Andover, with Canon Awdry as Rural Dean. Canon Blunt becomes Rural Dean of Kingsclere instead of Andover North; and the Rev. H. H. Pereira will be Rural Dean of Stockbridge, which is the new deanery created in the place of Andover South.

"NOT TO ALL THE PEOPLE."

BY THE REV. JOHN SELLER, F.S.Sc., CURATE OF ST. JOHN'S, CLECKHEATON, YORKSHIRE.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, ON SUNDAY, MAY 1ST, 1892.

"Him God raised up the third day, and showed Him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead."—ACTS x. 40, 41.

THESE words occur in St. Peter's address at the time of the admission of Cornelius and the first Gentiles into the Christian Church. It was a turning-point, or rather a new development in the progress of the new Society. It proclaimed the world-wide character of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The veil of the Temple had been rent in twain; the middle wall of partition had been thrown down for ever, and there was now full and unlimited access to the mercy-seat, to all the blessings of the Christian covenant both to Jew and Gentile. "To Him give all the prophets witness that through His name *whosoever* believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." After dwelling on the Person and Work and Death of Christ, St. Peter, in the words of our text, speaks of His Resurrection as a fact attested by the highest possible evidence: "Him God raised up the third day, and showed Him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead."

Now it is natural for us—and I think highly profitable too—during the forty days which intervene between Easter day and the Festival of the Ascension, to dwell very much in thought and meditation on the great fact and doctrine of the Resurrection of our Lord, as also upon His recorded acts and utterances during those last weeks. When we remember the central position which Christ's Resurrection fills in the Temple of Truth, we cannot be too well acquainted with its character and far-reaching significance. It is only of late years that the doctrine of the Resurrection of our Lord has begun to receive, at the hands either of preachers or theologians, anything like that prominence of treatment which it always deserved. Men have lost "the proportion of the faith" in their one-sided and extravagant exposition and defence of isolated truths. In considering the statement in the text, we shall necessarily be drawn to look at our Lord's Resurrection from a different point of view from any in which we have yet noticed it, but none the less instructive and important.

"Not to all the people." We may wonder why, after His Resurrection, Christ did not at once go and show Himself to the great body of the Jews. Would not this have been the best course to have

adopted—to have proved to *them* that He was indeed risen from the dead, and by rising from the grave had vindicated His claim to be the Messiah, the sent of God? Now, whatever might have been the immediate effects of such a public manifestation of Himself, it is enough to know that the risen Lord did not pursue such a course; and He must have had a good reason for not doing so.

Think for a moment of what would probably have followed upon a public manifestation of Himself. Suppose that after His Resurrection Jesus had again gone through the length and breadth of Palestine addressing the surging, excited crowds, and working miracles as in former days. Are they likely, think you, to have been convinced and won to faith in Him by this last and greatest miracle? Would the miracle of His Resurrection have brought them in trust and obedience to His feet? I think not. Had the Jews as a nation been privileged with such a manifestation of the risen Lord, their conduct would very probably have been much the same as before His death. They would not have been permanently benefited by it. Their wonder and amazement would have vanished just as suddenly as it came. Our blessed Saviour knew this, and so, as St. Peter here says, He showed Himself after His Resurrection "not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God."

A natural question arises—Why did our Lord after He was risen show Himself only to disciples, to those who believed in and followed Him? We may reverently answer that such a course was not only the most natural; it was the only one now possible. As one of the most learned of modern writers on the Resurrection has said, "His glorification began at the Resurrection; it was not possible for Him, therefore, to come into contact with the world again. To have done so would have been to have renewed His Passion." The Jews had had their opportunity. The Truth had been brought nigh to them, but, like their fathers, they rejected it and filled up the measure of their iniquities by crucifying the Lord of Life and Glory. Signs and wonders were powerless to save such a people: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though One rose from the dead."

"And so from the very nature of the case the risen Lord could come into contact only with disciples—with those in whom He might see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied. It would have been a renewal of the whole plan of our redemption, a confusing of the different steps of the economy of grace, had He after His Passion appeared to any but disciples. . . . . It was not only on His own account that our Lord could no more show Himself to the world; it was also because the world could neither have understood Him, nor have borne true witness to Him. The world could not have borne witness to what Jesus had become, and because it could not, it had no opportunity given it of making the attempt." When, therefore, He was risen from the dead, our Lord showed Himself "not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God."

From the last words of the text it would seem that St. Peter had in mind the eleven Apostles only, and yet we know there were many besides who in no unreal sense were Christ's chosen witnesses. It is probable there were many hundreds who had received and believed in Him before His death. St. Paul writes of the risen Lord manifesting Himself to above five hundred brethren at once, yet always and only to disciples. At the same time it was only to be expected that the Saviour should, during those forty days, appear oftener and more intimately to the eleven than to the rest of His followers. They, in a very special sense, were His witnesses. They were to be His ambassadors, instruments in founding His Church. To them had been committed the awful power and responsibility of remitting and retaining sins. Not only, therefore, were they assured of the reality of their Lord's Resurrection, but we may well believe that during those forty days they were being prepared by their Master for the great work to which He had called them. What that work was St. Peter here tells us in one word: they were to be *witnesses*. For this they had been chosen before by the Father, "Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me." But "witnesses" of what? A witness must have some fact or person concerning which he bears witness. From the first chapter of this same book we get our answer. When, just after the Ascension of our Lord the Apostles and believers generally were assembled for the purpose of electing one in the place of Judas Iscariot they prayed and said, "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that He was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us *of His Resurrection*."

This, then, was the great purpose for which they had been "chosen before of God"—to bear witness to the reality of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Upon this, as upon a rock, they were to rest all their teaching. Of the truth of such a miracle it was therefore necessary that they should have the fullest possible evidence. For if He whom they preached had not risen from the dead, then the entire fabric of the Christian religion and the faith of the individual believer crumbled and perished. But St. Peter here shows that they knew Whom they had believed, that they were witnesses, not to a dead but to a living Christ, with Whom we "did eat and drink . . . . after He rose from the dead." When, therefore, the risen Lord showed Himself during those forty days to the few only—to "witnesses chosen before of God"—we must not forget that it was the gracious purpose of Infinite Wisdom

and Love to so prepare and use them that they might, through the power of the Holy Ghost, be the effectual instruments in blessing the many, in beginning and establishing a work which would extend to the ends of the earth, and embrace in its loving designs the entire human race.

We learn, then, from the consideration of these words that God makes His fullest and most blessed revelations to the few, to those who believe in Him and obey Him. Whatever objections may have been urged against the reality of our Lord's Resurrection, on the ground that the only evidence we have is the evidence of believers, the course adopted by the risen Saviour in manifesting Himself to disciples only is not merely in perfect harmony with the whole plan and work of our redemption, but also with the eternal laws of truth and righteousness, so far as they have been revealed in Holy Scripture and evidenced in God's dealings alike with individuals and nations. He has never, so far as we know, made His highest and fullest and most direct revelations to the multitude—to the world. And the reason is obvious: they were not able to understand and receive such revelations; they lacked those moral and spiritual instincts and faculties which are necessary—at least in their beginnings—in those who are to be the recipients of so great and inestimable blessings. The risen Lord knew that the manifestation of Himself to the Jewish nation could result in no spiritual and abiding good to such a people. However glorious the destiny which once might have been theirs, they had proved themselves unworthy of it; they had shown themselves wanting in those moral and spiritual instincts necessary to salvation, and had given the final proof of their utter degeneracy as a people by rejecting and crucifying the only Hope of men. Those words uttered by some of themselves just after they had cast out the man born blind, whom Jesus had healed, were doubtless true, lamentably true, of the great body of the Jews: "And some of the Pharisees . . . . . said unto Him, Are we blind also? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin; but now ye say, we see; therefore your sin remaineth." For such a people there awaited no further illumination; between them and the truth there was a great gulf fixed. "They began by refusing to hear Moses and the prophets; they were not persuaded, though He, their true King, was risen from the dead."

The temper of the multitude is much the same now as then. They ask for signs—something which shall make faith easy and doubt impossible. They forget that "miracles are intended to assist those who are already seeking God. They are not intended to inflict a sense of God's power and presence and truth upon those who do not wish to know more about Him. A miracle cannot force the soul to believe; it does not act like imagination or a chemical solvent producing a certain effect whether man will or not." If we do not believe God's message as contained in the Scriptures and spoken by His faithful messengers we are not likely to be persuaded, though the grave-stones outside this church were this night to be broken up, "and the very dead to come forth to tell us, that the world to come is an awful and overwhelming reality."

And so to day God can only make His fullest revelations to His chosen ones, to those who, having heard the word, keep it and bring forth fruit with patience. It is still true, dear brethren, that "the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him." What then, I would ask, is the risen Lord to us? If He is still unknown by us, if He is still hardly more than a name to us, we may look well to ourselves. Whatever it be that hinders us from coming into close and personal relationship with Him must be abandoned, must be cast out. He longs to be to each of us a Saviour: a Deliverer from the slavery of sin and lust and worldliness: a Bringer in of pardon, and holiness, and eternal life. Shall we not gladly respond to His gracious purposes concerning us by truly turning from sin to God, by yielding all we have and are to Him who died for us and rose again? So shall we too find ourselves amongst those to whom He reveals Himself as He doth not unto the world.

"Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God." Yes, we also are His "witnesses," called to bear witness in our lives to the quickening and elevating power of His Resurrection life. Light and life have been imparted to us, not merely for our sakes, not simply that we ourselves may get to heaven, but that their blessed influence and power may radiate and ennoble and strengthen the lives of our struggling and tempted brothers and sisters around us. A lighthouse makes no noise, but the light which it silently casts over the dark ocean is none the less welcome to the storm-tossed mariner; and you and I, dear brethren, are called to be light-bearers in our several vocations, quietly and humbly reflecting that Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. When Ignatius was brought before the Roman Emperor, he called himself "Theophorus," and when asked why he called himself by this name, he replied that it was because he carried Christ in his breast. Ignatius could not only witness by word; he could die for Christ. We live in more peaceful times, when to profess the name of Christ is a common and easy thing; but His true followers are still called to witness to and for Him. He still has those to whom He reveals Himself in a fuller and more intimate manner than He can to the world. Still, as of old, He draws nearest to those who receive and love and obey Him.

THE death is announced of the Rev. Prebendary Hampden, Rector of Cradley, Great Malvern.

THE INTROIT OF THE SOUL.

II.—Repentance.

By the Rev. S. J. SYKES, B.A., Curate of Lower Mitton, Stourport, Worcestershire.

Sermon Preached at Lower Mitton Parish Church, on Sunday, May 15th, 1892.

"From that time Jesus began to preach and to say: Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."—St. Matthew iv. 17.

THE greatest fault is to be conscious of none. When in old time the Athenians sent to the Delphic Oracle to inquire who might be the wisest man in Greece, the god made answer, "Socrates." For a long time the philosopher was puzzled at this answer; until at length he understood why the choice had fallen upon him. It was because he alone had some conception of his own ignorance; he alone, seeing how much there was to be known, and how little he knew, was able to attach to that little that he did know its proper place and value. And this knowledge it was that the god took, and made the ground of his supremacy in wisdom.

The same lesson thus taught those Athenians as touching the lower range of the mere intellect, the Lord Christ showed mankind to be eternally true as touching the high domains of the heart and the moral life. The pagan god Apollo taught his votaries that the first test and fruit of any knowledge was the consciousness of ignorance. The Eternal and only-begotten Son of God taught men that the first test and fruit of a new principle of holiness in them is a bitter consciousness of sin—a consciousness that grows more painful and more vivid with increase of holiness and of gifts of grace; insomuch that St. Paul uses no exaggeration, employs no wilful deception, exhibits no merely affected humility when he says—"sinners, of whom I am chief."

You will remember who in the Bible is called the man after God's own heart. David, the Hebrew king, who had been guilty of a lying deception practised upon the king of Gath: of adultery with Bathsheba: of the murder of Uriah: of direct and wilful disobedience to God in the numbering of the people: who was not permitted to build the Temple because his hands were stained with blood. And Carlyle reminds us that the sneer has been raised, "Is this your man after God's own heart? What God shall this be then?" My brethren, the sneer is a shallow one. Our answer is ready—a God who recognises Repentance. David was a son of Adam, and therefore of necessity tainted with sin; but he was "after God's own heart" because he knew what it was to repent. Read those Psalms in which his soul turned inward on itself, and expressed his large spiritual experience. "Where," asks Dean Church, "in those rough cruel days did they come from, those piercing, lightning-like gleams of strange spiritual truth, those magnificent outlooks over the kingdom of God; those raptures at His presence and His glory; those wonderful disclosures of self-knowledge; those pure outpourings of the love of God? Surely here is something more than the mere working of the mind of man. Surely they tell of higher guiding, prepared for all time; surely they hear the word behind them saying, 'This is the way, walk ye in it'; they repeat the whispers of the Spirit of God; they reflect the very light of the Eternal Wisdom." Such is the high inspiration of true Repentance.

David's life and history, as written in those Psalms of his, is the truest emblem ever given of a man's moral progress and warfare here below. All earnest souls (we paraphrase once more the philosopher referred to above) will ever discover in it the faithful struggle of a kindred soul towards what is good and best. Struggle often baffled, sore baffled; ever, with tears, repentance, true unconquerable purpose, begun anew. Is not man's walking in truth always that—a succession of falls? Man can do no other. "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." That the struggle *be* honest, that the repentance *be* sincere, that is the question of questions. The outward details of a life, with its failings and faults, God overlooks for the sake of His Immaculate Son, our most Holy Redeemer, if the *inner secret* of the life, the yearning agonies of repentance, the going-out of the soul to Him and to His holiness be true.

We cannot wonder that these Psalms were so often upon the lips of Christ as He spoke to men. The spirit that breathed through them was the spirit that He sought to quicken in men's minds, to awaken in them as a daily inspiration, and an unfailing guide. It was the spirit of humility, of simple trustful dependence upon the All-Father, of steadfast faith in Him as One who loves, and will not be cruel; as One who is all-wise, and cannot make a mistake; as One who is supreme, and acts only by His own will. Christ appealed to mankind, not in virtue of its own strength, but through its weakness. The little knot of simple fisher-folk that hung upon the words of the still unknown Teacher grew into the gathered crowds that pressed upon the Prophet of Galilee in the Judaic capital, and these have swelled into the kindreds and nations that have for centuries hung upon the words of the Son of God, not because He gave them a rule of life; not because He constructed for them some ethical philosophy; not because He exhibited to them the dignity of their nature as consisting in its independence of any God, in its self-sufficiency, or its self-reliance; but because (speaking as one having authority, and not as the scribes) He showed them that their dependence upon the All-Father *was* their liberty; that their sufficiency was in their eternal Sonship;

that a rule of life could bring them within reach of the high dignity destined for them only if it sprang from a spirit within themselves, from a new principle of life within themselves—a principle of life that could be quickened and grow only in the atmosphere of obedience, humility, and prayer. He came to men, not along the line of their proud, self-sufficient speculations and theories, but along the line of their humble and repentant sense of need. Not the philosophic, wealthy Sadducee, who boasted of his acquaintance with the theorisings of the heathen writers, and who looked with pride upon his sect as one exclusive and refined, from which the poor and ignorant and humble were shut out; not the rigorous, self-righteous Pharisee, who fashioned out of a hard and fast rule and tradition a rope to tether him to the stake of his miserable formalism; not the Herodian, with his dreams of political developments which should found the kingdom of God out of the petty things of sense, by the sword and by money and by blood—not these felt their hearts burn within them at His words. His message, because it was universal and from God, pertaining to heavenly gifts and not to mere earthly interests, could not awake a response in hearts like these, which the paralysing power of sense had deadened to highest influence. The man who smote upon his breast and cried, "God be merciful to me a sinner!" the woman whom others spurned, but who crept to His feet and bathed them with her tears—these heard, and were glad.

It is surely a comforting thing for us men and women, with our daily difficulties, our constant imperfections, our endless falls, to remember that the public teaching of the Incarnate God began with the word *Repent*. The smallest thing that can be expected of a man who has done wrong is that he should be sorry for the wrong that he has done. Yet Christ took that simple act, and made it, with Faith, the stepping-stone to God—a linked sweetness in the music of the soul's introit.

And the sneer that I mentioned a moment ago—the sneer that said of David, "Is this your man after God's heart?"—says of repentance, "Is that your panacea for sin? It is a cheap one." But the sneer is as shallow as it was before. A favourite argument fifty years ago (as I was told by an old man in this town), when the railroad was first ploughing the bosom of our land, was, that by making transit so easy, crime would be increased, for the criminal might with ease put a hundred miles between himself and the scene of his work. The sagacity that framed that argument did not perceive that the same power that sped the criminal could speed the detective too. So, likewise, the same power that brings repentance brings the whole man nearer God, and throws around the moral nature in its completeness an atmosphere which makes sin more horrible, and, therefore, more difficult. Remember that an act, whether it be evil or whether it be good, is not passing in its effect. The act, whether evil or good, is strung on the thread of your experience, and remains, an influence, for all time. Let me illustrate briefly: You drive a nail into a polished surface; you regret your action; you withdraw the nail. Yes; but the mark remains. You are betrayed into falsehood: you are smitten by conscience, you confess, and make the reparation in your power. Yes; but the lie has been told, you are not the same as you were before you told the lie. But, thank God, what is true of evil is also true of good. You are broken with remorse, you are agonised by true repentance, you are brought nearer to God The act is registered in your experience, nothing can wipe it out, you have been brought nearer God; that influence *must* work in the tangled skein of your life while it lasts. Your repentance has raised you to a higher plane, has given you clearer vision, has breathed around you a purer atmosphere. You may fall into sin, and yet by God's grace you "may rise again on stepping-stones of your dead self to higher things." The repentance you did feel is registered for ever, a power in the working out of your soul's life. Therefore anything that makes sin easier and not infinitely more revolting and difficult, is not a holy and true repentance, but a hateful and vile hypocrisy.

Repent. A perpetual struggle, but eyes ever heavenward. "The barley," says Luther, in a simple but striking figure—"the barley which we brew, the flax of which we weave our garments, must be bruised and torn ere they come to the use for which they are grown. The natural creature must be combed and threshed." And so likewise Goethe: "The natural man is like the ore out of the iron mine. It is smelted in the furnace; it is forged into bars upon the anvil. A new nature is at last forced upon it, and it is made steel."

Surely this is a great revelation of the character of God. Surely it is no small thing that men should have heard from the lips of the Incarnate God that truth the conviction of which alone makes possible a religious life: the truth that what is required from man by the Author of his being is something that he can perform; something that is not beyond his reach, even though he be penniless, deformed in body, dwarfed in intellect, friendless, diseased, covered with misfortune, an outcast among men.

Brethren, we have this morning prayed that it would please God to give us true Repentance. Let the prayer be not merely a form of words, but an holy and sincere desire, which we by honest effort earnestly seek to realise. To that intent turn the eye of Faith towards the brightness of God's sanctity, and in that light examine your own unworthiness. And the torture of that contrast, the blinding glories of the one, the poor deformities of the other will, if anything will, bring you to your knees and unseal the springs of true penitential grief.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 4, 1892.

PARLIAMENT.

BEFORE these lines are printed the exact date of the dissolution will be known. The Twelfth Parliament of Victoria is dead and buried to all intents and purposes. The Opposition, however, do not seem to rejoice. They have been "wanting to know, you know" for a considerable time past, they have represented the Government as indecently clinging to the last few hours of office, and keeping them, to the last moment, out of the triumph in store for them at the polls. Their fears have proved groundless, but they are not pleased thereat. The Opposition, at least for the moment, has collapsed. The Government Bills which were threatened with the most determined opposition have been passed by sweeping majorities, 92 for Irish Local Government, 99 for Irish Education, while the persistent obstruction of the Clergy Discipline Bill, carried on by Liberals in defiance of their chief, also broke down at the last moment.

The case of the Opposition against the Government must be very much weakened by all this. They cannot very well attack legislation outside the House which they have only half-resisted inside it. But, indeed, it is hard to see what case they have at all. Probably they will go on flogging the dead horse of coercion; but since they have declared that compulsory education is also coercion hateful and undisguised, that will not help them much. It will be very hard to galvanise Home Rule itself into life in the constituencies. Disestablishment is out of reach. The curious catalogue known as the Newcastle Programme has been partly anticipated, partly exploded, largely abandoned, and the Radical papers themselves are busily inventing excuses for dropping it piecemeal.

In fact the collapse of the Opposition is all round. We suppose they will revive—and a good deal must be allowed at the polls, in any case, for popular love of change. But that seems just now the strongest horse in the opposition team, more so than Mr. Gladstone's personal influence. True, that must not be left out of account; by age, by experience, by genius, if not by statesmanship, Mr. Gladstone stands out as the most prominent political chief of our time. But there is an increasing tendency to go for measures, and not for men; and, setting aside Mr. Gladstone's great personality, what has he to offer us in the next Parliament? Simply nothing, from the mere fact that we cannot calculate upon his life. Far be it from us to reckon, as many honourable Tories have been accused by dishonourable Radicals of doing, on the certainty that Mr. Gladstone's days are numbered. We trust he may yet have years of life before him. But he has already passed the common limit of human existence; at any hour he might be cut down, how can we reckon upon any measures, even of the most beneficial kind, being carried out under such circumstances. It is most uncertain that Mr. Gladstone would be spared to pass any of his measures, it is absolutely certain that he would never be able to superintend their working and to introduce when necessary improvements and corrections. Mr. Gladstone goes before the electors as a candidate for power, who will be utterly irresponsible for the use he makes of it. And after Mr. Gladstone—the deluge, or worse. If even his commanding influence has been unable to keep the Opposition together, what will happen when he is gone. If they have thus collapsed with him, what will they be without him? These facts discount Mr. Gladstone's influence, we cannot tell how long it will last, we see it is already on the wane. And this again goes against the Opposition. They are a party already disorganised and on the verge of disruption; it may be postponed, but it must come. On the whole we see every chance that the dead Parliament will be worthily succeeded, and that the Unionist Government will return to a new lease of power, strong in the confidence of the country and in union with itself.

WARNING TO NONCONFORMISTS.

TO arrogate to themselves all political honour in Ireland has been long the ambition of the Irish priesthood, but the way in which the oracle would be worked was never quite so patent as it now is. When a business meeting of the directors of the amalgamated Nationalist paper, now called *The Freeman's Journal and National Press*, was called last week, it transpired that Archbishop Walsh had collected proxy votes to the amount of 8,620 shares which he had handed over

to a solicitor, Mr. Scallan, to cast according to his directions. For an ecclesiastic this is certainly a tremendous act of political dictation. His solicitor made it worse by at once exhibiting the proxies and avowing his intention of using them all in Mr. Healy's interest. Then Mr. Dillon made one of those pithy confessions which have more weight than many Unionist speeches. His declaration was as follows:—"I say that nothing could be more indecent, nothing more calculated to injure the Nationalist cause than what Mr. Scallan has just done. We are charged, as Irish Nationalists, with not conducting this movement independently of priestly dictation; and though there is no man in this country who has a greater respect for the Archbishop of Dublin than I have, I say without hesitation that if this thing is to be carried by a system of this kind, then there is an end of the Nationalist movement. Is it we, the laymen of the country, who are to have the conducting of this national journal and movement, or is it the Archbishop of Dublin? (Interruption.) I say the question of using his Grace's proxies was not before the meeting, and it was time enough to cast these proxies when the time and the hour came for voting. But should they be suddenly burst out on this meeting for the purpose of suppressing the rights of the Shareholders? I say it is a dangerous and most imprudent thing for the cause in which we are all interested, and for the whole future position of this newspaper. (Interruption.) It is idle for us to stand before a country, and before England—for we must stand if we are to save this country and this cause—we must stand as the representatives of the people; and I say it is idle to stand if we are to be silenced by the motion of a nominee, if we are not to be allowed to take counsel for our country, and for the interest of this paper, without having a club, a pistol held to our heads – a sword held over our heads in the shape of nearly nine thousand proxies held in the hands of his Grace."

There is no need to comment upon Mr. Dillon's protest. His words should be burned into the conscience of every Nonconformist in Great Britain, for they demonstrate the truth of every word spoken by Lord Salisbury at Hastings as to the future of such Protestants under a Government consisting of nominees of Archbishop Walsh. It *is* the Archbishop and not the laymen of Ireland who would control not only the press but the platform and the Parliament of Ireland. This is the whole case of the Ulster Protestants put in a nutshell, and Mr. Dillon has proved it to the satisfaction of every sensible man in the kingdom.

The Rev. W. Bury, M.A., rector of Harlestone, was, on Saturday, the 21st ult., installed to the third honorary canonry in Peterborough Cathedral, rendered vacant by the death of Canon Lindsay, rector of Kettering.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION *VERSUS* AIONIAL PURGATORY.

Sir,—"J. B." is quite correct in his "observation that the conceptions brought forward by me differ in a material degree from his." Of course they do. I hold the Scriptural doctrine of eternal destruction: he holds what I consider the very unscriptural doctrine of *aionial* purgatory. The two "conceptions" are materially different.

It is a pity he did not in the first instance speak of "human beings," instead of "intelligent beings,' since it is quite evident that it was human beings, whether intelligent or not, that he meant, to the exclusion of such admittedly "intelligent beings" as dogs, and, I suppose, devils also.

I cannot admit for one moment that it is "legitimately and rationally," or at all, the same thing to say that God "purposes to bestow immortality, etc., on all the race of Adam," and to say that "immortality has been conferred" on all the race of Adam, "and will be sustained." On the contrary, the two sayings are plainly inconsistent one with the other, and in many points of view—in one especially that I indicated in my last—they are importantly different. Both statements I believe to be contrary to the revealed truth of Holy Scripture. For instance, in Rom. ii. we are told of some who, by patient continuance in well-doing seek for immortality as well as glory and honour, and that to them God will give eternal life (which sounds very like immortality); while others who do not so seek for it will "perish" instead, without ever getting eternal life or immortality. Certainly every purpose of God will be fulfilled; and if it is His purpose to bestow immortality on every member of the race of Adam, every member of the race of Adam will have it sooner or later. But I maintain that no such purpose of God is revealed, and that much is revealed which is utterly contrary to the existence of any such purpose. How does it consist with any such purpose that our Lord threatens destruction of both body and soul in hell to some, and that we are told that some will "utterly perish," "like natural brute beasts"?

"J. B." is not quite correct in saying, "I am able to contemplate with serenity, as a final result of the Scheme of Redemption, that 'some will be destroyed, body and soul, in hell, in an everlasting destruction; while others will be united to Christ, and have a joyful immortality.'" For (1) I do not hold that the eternal destruction of the finally impenitent is a "result of the Scheme of Redemption"; and (2) I do not, and am not able to, contemplate their eternal destruction with serenity. I could not contemplate man's capital punishment with serenity; still less could I contemplate God's capital punishment with serenity. But surely "J. B." believes that some, not all the race of Adam, "will be destroyed body and soul in hell, in an everlasting destruction," otherwise he disbelieves our Lord and St. Paul; and surely he also believes that some, instead of being so destroyed with an everlasting destruction, will be—nay, are even now—united to Christ and will have a joyful immortality. We both, I hope, believe both of these revealed truths; where we differ is, that he holds, and I do not, that those who

are destroyed body and soul in hell with an everlasting destruction, will also, after more or less "millions of ages of suffering" in hell—where they are not really destroyed body and soul at all, only tormented for their good—"be united to Christ, and have a joyful immortality."

I do not doubt for a moment that "J. B.," as one of the elect people of God, will have suitable employment prepared for him to walk in; and if it were only revealed I would gladly believe that he will be employed (not throughout his blessed eternity, but for a portion of it—as long as sin exists in God's universe) as an instrument in rescuing the lost. But I cannot believe that he will ever be used as an instrument of good to those whom God has actually destroyed body and soul in hell.

I think if those who are sentenced to that doom were given their choice between eternal destruction, utterly perishing like natural brute beasts on the one hand, and on the other spending a few "millions of ages" in the agonies of a lake of fire, or of some state of suffering truthfully even if figuratively so described, and then being holy and happy for the rest of eternity, they would unhesitatingly one and all prefer the former; aye, would protest against the horrible injustice of visiting them with this last lot when it was the other that was plainly threatened them by the God who is their judge.

For my own part I protest against any one ascribing such horrible injustice to God as is involved in the supposition that He will take that way of bringing any one to the same state of holiness and happiness as "J. B." and other elect people are brought to by such an infinitely easier and shorter route. Where *is* the sense of imagining that being destroyed body and soul in a lake of fire could possibly have any such effect as "J. B." imagines is reached by it? How is it reasonable to suppose that millions of ages of such suffering could possibly be necessary in the case of even the most hardened sinner that ever lived? Supposing the means of salvation "J. B." contemplates for the non-elect could possibly be a means of salvation at all, why in the world need the application of the means be so awfully prolonged?

I do not pretend to understand "J. B.'s" anxiety to get rid of the "delightfulness" with which "he believes that he is dependent every moment of existence on the Divine presence and energy," and to become "a free agent" instead, especially when Locke says he does not see how it can be done any way. Why can't he let it alone and keep the delightfulness he at present enjoys for ever, even though he imagines he is not "a free agent" while it lasts?

But does he suppose that "millions of ages" in hell are necessary for the bursting or combustion of his bonds and making him "a free agent" instead of a "puppet"? It really seems that he thinks so, in his own case as well as in the case of those who are doomed to eternal destruction, for he says "to make *me* a free agent." I thought from his former letter that he and other elect people were to become free agents instead of puppets by the same short and easy course as leads them in the course of some fifty years or so into the everlasting felicity enjoyed by those who die in the Lord. But I gather from his last that I was mistaken. If so, I would earnestly ask him to consider whether the game is worth the candle. Why not remain a happy "puppet" in his present delightful sense of dependence on God (as for my part I believe the highest archangel in heaven is dependent on Him) rather than think of attaining to the proud condition of a "free agent" at such a terrible cost and by such a prolonged and difficult and trying process as he seems prepared to undergo?

I hope he will not forget to answer the question at the end of my last letter as to whether the sinners against the Holy Ghost will ever be forgiven, or will be united to Christ for endless life and immortality without being forgiven.

May 28th, 1892. VINDEX.

P.S.—"J. B." will be interested to know that his friend John Locke was a firm believer in conditional immortality and eternal destruction.—V.

THE CAMBRIDGE CASE.

SIR,—Your correspondent "B.," in your number, May 21st, is severe on clergymen. They may perhaps have given him cause for his censure. But in the case of which he writes the judge was *not* a clergyman.

T.

PREBENDARY BASSETT'S SERMON.

SIR,—I regret to see the Rev. Prebendary Bassett, in the sermon reported in the PULPIT of March 14th, throwing away his powers in another futile attempt to read the conclusions of modern science into the inspired poetry of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis.

That chapter is a description, in outline, of the work of creation, beginning with the assertion that the universe was neither self-existent nor the work of any inferior deity, but of God, and ending with the declaration that Man was made in God's image, which, in whatever sense it is to be understood, must in some sense be true in order to make the Incarnation possible. Between these theological truths come the details of the creative process told in unscientific language to intelligent but unscientific men. It is told as a master of science, being also a believer in God, might in these days tell it to his young children, though he would not introduce the refrain about evening and morning.

This refrain, however, is obviously merely poetical: this is admitted by Prebendary Bassett in admitting, as all now admit, that the days are indefinite periods. There is, however, a real difficulty—a difficulty of interpretation I mean, for I do not admit that this chapter contains, or can contain, any difficulties of a higher order—about the origin of light and of the heavenly bodies. We are told that light was created before the sun. The preacher explains this as a hint of what is now known to be highly probable, if not indeed certain, namely, that matter existed in the nebulous form, and emitted light, before it was condensed into suns and planets. Now, ought we to believe, on any short of conclusive evidence, that the Holy Spirit, in speaking to man through a prophet, dropped hints of truth, not of a spiritual nature to be lived by, but physical, and to be verified by scientific methods which have nothing to do with spiritual life?

The same remark applies with still greater force to that which constitutes the chief difficulty in the chapter, namely, that strange dislocation of the obvious order, whereby the creation of the visible heavens, with the sun,

moon, and stars, comes between the creation of the vegetable kingdom and that of the animal. It is obvious that vegetables should come before animals, because animals live on vegetables. But how can the creation of the heavens and the sun have come between? The preacher suggests that what is called the creation of the sun means the detachment of the earth from the primeval nebula, whereof the centre afterwards formed the sun. This is liable to the same objection with the previous suggestion; but, moreover, though I do not speak with authority, I cannot think that both the earth and the sun could have been sufficiently cooled down to permit the existence of vegetable life on the earth's surface soon after its separation from the sun, and before the sun had been consolidated. On every ground it is better to let this question stand over as an unsolved and probably insoluble difficulty.

Prebendary Bassett assents to the nebula theory, which is the theory of evolution applied to the universe of stars and planets. Why then should he deny the same of the world of life? Nothing in the Book of Genesis contradicts it, and if the scientific believer whom I have imagined describing the creation of the world to young children also believed in evolution, he need not alter a word. This, however, must be understood with the reservation, that in the creation of man's spiritual nature there was an exertion of Divine power of a different kind from that required to create the universe of matter, and to guide its evolution.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, May 24th, 1892.

THE Rev. Richard Hudson Gibson, M.A., rector of Lound, near Lowestoft, and honorary Canon of Norwich, was on Wednesday morning, the 25th ult., collated and instituted by the Bishop of Norwich, as Archdeacon of Suffolk, in succession to the late Archdeacon Woolley. Immediately before evensong the new Archdeacon attended in the vestry before the Vice-Dean (Canon Robinson), the Dean being unavoidably absent. Here he exhibited his letters of collation and the Bishop's mandate, and prayed to be installed accordingly. The oath of allegiance and the oath to observe the local statutes were next administered, and the usual order of evening service was then begun. After the first lesson Minor Canon Moore conducted the Archdeacen from the vestry to the nave, and presented him to the Vice-Dean, who, after the usual formalities, conducted the Archdeacon to his proper stall in the choir. Archdeacon Gibson will read himself in and preach at the cathedral on August 7th. The service was held in the nave, the choir and chancel being closed for important restorative work.

THE Bishop of Sodor and Man (Dr. Straton) was installed in St. Mary's Government Chapel, Castletown, on Saturday, the 28th ult., by Archdeacon Hughes-Games, who preached a sermon from St. Matt. xxviii. 20. The customary oaths were afterwards administered in the Court House, Castle Rushen, by the Lieutenant-Governor, Dr. Spencer Walpole. An address of congratulation from the inhabitants of the ancient metropolis and its vicinity was presented by the High Bailiff, Mr. James Stowell Gell. The Bishop, in reply, thanked the Governor and Mr. Gell for their kindly words. He trusted that during his experience as a clergyman he had learned the lessons of toleration and kindly feeling. He hoped that when his episcopate ended it would be said that he had done what he could for the extension of the Christian Church, for the good of the people, and for the welfare of the Isle of Man. At the close of the proceedings, his lordship and the clergy of the diocese were entertained to luncheon by Her Majesty's Attorney-General for the Isle of Man (Sir James Gell) and Lady Gell.

SOME little consternation was caused during a confirmation at St. Thomas's-in-the-Moors Church, Balsall Heath, Birmingham. The Bishop of Worcester was giving an address from the pulpit to the candidates. His lordship was in the midst of an earnest exhortation, when it was suddenly observed by the congregation that one of the Bishop's lawn sleeves had become ignited from the candle-light. Dr. Perowne had not apparently noticed the conflagration, and was somewhat taken by surprise when one of the churchwardens made rapid strides up the few steps leading to the pulpit, followed quickly by the curate, and pointed out the danger. The extinction was the work of a few moments, though the sleeve was completely destroyed.

ON the afternoon of Ascension Day, a special service was held at St. James's Church, Northampton, for Mr. T. Taylor (formerly Congregational minister, Blackley), to be publicly admitted to the office of Lay Reader for that parish by the Bishop of Leicester. After prayers, the hymn, "Lord, speak to me that I may speak," was sung, and the Bishop of Leicester then performed the office of publicly admitting the lay reader, the congregation standing. At the close of the ceremony, his lordship pronounced the Blessing. Subsequently a public tea was provided at the new Parochial School-room, and was numerously attended, about 150 ladies and gentlemen being present.—*Northampton Herald.*

LAST Sunday fifty sermons were preached in the diocese of St. Asaph on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. This united movement began on a very small scale some years ago under the Rev. T. Lloyd Williams, the organising secretary for the diocese in the deanery of Wrexham. But it has already extended beyond the deanery, and thirty clergymen advocated the claims of the society this year, and exchanged pulpits. The laity also begin to recognise their duty to support the society, even when they are absent, by sending their contributions to the clergy and through their friends. The clergy in several deaneries last year joined in a similar plan by placing their services entirely in the hands of the secretaries for their respective deaneries. The result is that there is hardly a blank in the report of those deaneries, and poor parishes are thus reached which could not possibly command, or reasonably expect, a deputation. Meetings also are being addressed daily by the Rev. T. Flavell, from New Zealand, the organising secretary, and others.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Cobbold, Rev. R. F., M.A., Senior Assistant-Master at Macclesfield Grammar-school; Chaplain of St. John's Cathedral Church, Hong Kong.

Cockshott, Rev. Canon J. H., M.A., Rector of Stretham-with-Thetford; Rural Dean of Ely.

Cree, Rev. Edward C., Curate of Howden, Yorkshire; Honorary Secretary at Ackworth, Yorkshire, for the Mission to Seamen Society.

Davenport, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of Southowram; Vicar of Coley, Yorkshire.
De Chair, Rev. F. B., M.A., Rector of Morley and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Norwich Cathedral.
Gale, Rev. J. S., B.A.; Incumbent of Hopetown-with-De Aar, Diocese of Grahamstown, South Africa.
Gwyn, Rev. Arthur Rice, M.A., Curate of Swanington; Rector of Suffield, Norfolk.
Harkness, Rev. William Jardine, M.A.; Rector of Hanslope-with-Castlethorpe, Bucks.
Hayton, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Toft, Knutsford; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cheshire (Mr. T. Ismay, of Dawpool, Birkenhead).
Hennell, Rev. H. B., Curate of Canton, Cardiff; Rector of Tintern, Chepstow.
Hunt, Rev. Wray William Mills, B.A.; Rector of Trowell, Notts.
Kendle, Rev. William James, M.A., Rector of Woodsford-cum-Tincleton; Secretary and Treasurer of the West Dorset District Union of the English Church Union.
Kermode, Rev. Sidney Alfred Pizey, M.A.; Vicar of Onchan, Isle of Man.
Knapp, Rev. Martin Arthur, Association Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society; Vicar of North Wootton, Somerset.
Knox, Rev. Frederick William, Curate of Bredon-with-Norton, Tewkesbury; Chaplain of Belvoir Castle.
Layton, Rev. Thomas Charles Lichfield, M.A.; Rector of Caldecott, Herts.
Legge, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Vicar of Wiggenhall St. German; Vicar of Wiggenhall St. Peter, Norfolk.
Ling, Rev. Henry Pratt, M.A.; Vicar of Stanton-on-the-Wolds, Notts.
Loney, Rev. W., B.D., Curate of St. Paul's, Darlington; Vicar of Stanley, near Crook, Durham.
Marwood, Rev. George H.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Rodney*.
Matthews, Rev. Frank, Priest-in-Charge of St. Columba's, Newton, Glasgow; Rector of St. Paul's, Rothesay.
Parez, Rev. Claude Hubert, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Paul, Rev. F. Campbell, M.A., Curate of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London; Rector of St. Peter's, Bristol.
Phillips, Rev. James B., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Thomas's, Leesfield, Oldham; Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's Parish Church, Hulme.
Pycock, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of All Saints' Huntingdon; Rector of Hatley St. George, Cambridgeshire.
Raine, Rev. Isaac, L.Th.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Scott, Rev. Robert; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Sheringham, Rev. H. A., M.A., Vicar of Tewkesbury; Chaplain of Tewkesbury Union.
Solomon, Rev. Richard, Senior Curate of St. Mark's, Dalston; Vicar of St. Luke's, Hackney.
Stukeley, Rev. Edward Charles, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Taylor, Rev. Robert William, M.A., Curate of Hartlebury; Rector of Wouldham, Kent.
Teesdale, Rev. F. D., M.A.; Vicar of Bodicote, Banbury.
Warne, Rev. Alfred T., M.A.; Curate-in-Charge of St. Barnabas's Mission District in the parish of Holy Trinity, Poulton-le-Sands.
Whichelow, Rev. James Shearer, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Spitalfields, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Bedford; Rural Dean of Spitalfields.
Wilkins, Rev. Lawrence, M.A., Curate of St. Andrew's, Derby; Perpetual Curate of St. James's, Nottingham.
Williams, Rev. T. L. L., M.A., Vicar Choral of St. Asaph Cathedral and Canon Missioner of the diocese; Rector of Bala.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Chester, Rev. Greville John, of 2, Russell-chambers, Bloomsbury, on the 22rd ult., aged 62.
Hampden, Rev. Prebendary Edward Renn, M.A., Rector of the parish, at Cradley, Great Malvern, on the 22nd ult., aged 66.
Tugwell, Rev. Frederick, Vicar of Havering-atte-Bower, Romford, at the Vicarage, on the 28th ult., aged 80.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time my vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitated for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for more than an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses, Mr. Harness's Electropathic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restorine appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post-paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE GROWTH OF JESUS.

By Rev. Canon H. SCOTT-HOLLAND.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, January 10th, 1892.

"And when they saw Him, they were amazed: and His mother said unto Him, Son, why hast Thou thus dealt with us? Behold Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing. And He said unto them, How is it that ye sought Me? Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" —Luke ii. 48, 49.

WE know how it sometimes happens that a scene which has been for years familiar and beloved suddenly greets us with a new impression; we have caught it from some unexpected angle, or a flying light has shot over it, bringing out some colour or some effect or contrast which we never before had the chance to hit upon. There it is, the old habitual place which we fancied we knew by heart; and yet there is a look to-day which we had never suspected, which we had hitherto missed; a touch of beauty, a flash of significance has given it a new appearance, and the novelty of the effect is heightened by the very fact that it is brought out of materials so intimately known. Now, is not that often the case with the four Gospels? Those wonderful books, how well we seem to know them! From our earliest memories familiar rhythms have sown the old, old story in our hearts. We turn the pages and cast the eye along them, and now and again a fresh gleam of light falls, and some fragment of the Gospel story starts into swift radiant prominence. We had read it a thousand times before, and yet it lay unmarked, without special notice among the many. But to-day it stands out, as it were, alone; a peculiar force lies about it. How is it that we can have passed it over so easily? How is it we missed for so long this vivid interest? So the Gospels prove and verify themselves to each new generation. The story is as old as ever. But new points of perspective are taken up, new suns shine, and it comes about that often what was before in foremost imagination drops back into shadow, and that which was of old a part of the broad and general background, leaps forward into sharp singularity of light. Some such prominence has fallen nowaday on the scene recorded by St. Luke, to which my text refers.

So, strangely alone, stands that story of the boyhood plucked out of the heart, of that silence which hovers over the long hours of our Lord's growth at Nazareth. How He sighed to penetrate within that shrouding silence during which the tender plant sprang up as a root out of the dry ground! Would that we might follow its unrecorded process in the mastery of which He passed, from the unconscious impotence of the babe in the manger, swathed in swaddling clothes, to that full bright condition of manhood in the ministry; complete, self-mastered, sure-footed, clear in aim and purpose. He grew point by point, stage by stage. Life opened upon him according to its own proper graduated rules. When He was a child He thought as a child, spake as a child, felt as a child. Only as He slowly became a man did He put away childish things. He was a real living, joyous child, with merry heart, glowing limbs, and dancing feet. Then He must have gone, at six years old, to the village school, to sit in His class with the teacher, as you can see children to-day at Cairo; and He must have learnt by word of mouth, by question and answer, the texts from Leviticus with which, a boy, His education began, which told of sacrifice, atonement, and burnt-offering, and of all the deep ritual of that great Temple, yet unseen, which he would one day come to visit, to become a Son of the Covenant—that Temple whose doom He should Himself pronounce as He wept over it the tears of a loyal-hearted Jew—to foresee that day when there should not be left in it one stone on another which should not be cast down. So He must have grown, His experience must have grown, and His faculties must have awakened, and His powers made their first experiment. His strength must have increased, His muscles expanded, and His thought and imagination and will,—first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear. It cannot be otherwise. In becoming a man He became all that man essentially is when he grows into his full stature. This process of growth is no accident, it is part of human nature. Each moment which belongs essentially to the normal natural growth must the Lord have taken and hallowed and sealed. Through all this patient advance He stood. In taking upon Himself to deliver man He willingly abhorred not the virgin's womb.

Now, growth is what we nowadays have learned to emphasise. All our discoveries, whether critical or scientific, carry us to the methods by which men and things grow. In gaining that insight we have lost something—lost the power to grasp the ends which we intend. Development is our watchword in every department of knowledge. When once we have analysed the growth we are too apt to rest satisfied. We seem to know all about it that needs to be known. That is our temper. Therefore it is with a special and irrepressible interest that the problem of our Lord's growth presents itself to us—because it presents itself with a colouring that it

never could have had before. Even as the corn grows while men rise and sleep according to its scale of graduated degrees, so the blessed Child opened out on the earth in the wistful silence of the Galilean home; and we gather from St. Luke the assurance that in that quiet hiding-place He did undergo the movements and changes that we associated with growth. The watching of the process is denied us, but the word of the Evangelist secures the knowledge that it was done. "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man." He grew step by step and rose to the full range of the mind and body, and the full measure of gifted graciousness. It may be hard, indeed, for the subtlest theology to tread securely amid the delicate intricacy of relationship, and knit the growing intellect well to the personal word of God.

But after all theology is bound over in service to the positive facts of the Gospel life. Its sole office is to obey them. The facts hold their own and find their own reconciliation just as we hold on our way. The Gospel life is the supreme reality: it is the sole test and rule and standard into which all dogmatic reasoning must fall. It remains a plain fact that Jesus increased as time proceeded. He was content to assume the limitation of growth, and took upon Him not only our flesh, but the conditions under which our flesh arrives at its proper stage of existence. He grew in wisdom and stature and favour. That is surely most blessed news! If we may not watch it, yet to be assured of its existence is our comfort. With what avidity do we fasten on this solitary story, which the diligence of St. Luke has been guided to rescue out of all that hidden mystery of growth for our loving attention! Here, he has been allowed to bring before us not merely the fact of the broad and sacred process by human nature, but the most wonderful instance of His increase when He arrived at a new level, as it were, almost at a bound. Let us turn to our own experience in order to guess a little at the infinitely higher form which our Lord gained. In our own human lives there is some such moment, surely as is suggested by our narrative, a moment at which youth first wakes out of its childhood and becomes aware of this. The soul seems suddenly to burst its sheath and some novel experience strikes it, and something releases the force that has lain dormant. At a touch, in a twinkling, the chain is snapped and the slumber is broken. We all know how buds, swelling in silence, break out in some happy hour of spring when the winds are warm. So with the soul. It gives a leap, the door is flung open, and it enters a new scene. Everything that has occupied it has fallen in a dream as a childish game. It may be it is aware of its own spiritual independence and solitary dignity and royal inheritance. Such a moment is never forgotten. The moment the boy ceases to see through the eyes of others and to speak and think as they do, when he sees with his own eyes and faces his own world and seeks for his own interpretation of it, such moments are full of a great awe. We are wrapped, then, in a solitude of our own; we forget our earlier interests "as a very little thing," and we are absorbed in the passion of a spiritual discovery. We are caught up in the solemnity of this sudden awakening, which gives the power to make our noisy years as moments in the course of eternal silence. Many men and women can recall echoes of such times. Perhaps long after we have forgotten them we drop upon some grave resolution written with our unformed hand in some boy diary, a record of something at which we smile as our eyes fall upon it, smile with a sad regret that with all our wiser intelligence we have not retained the intention and earnestness of it, which makes sacred that old scrawl. Such may have been our own experience, marred, no doubt, by wilfulness, and clouded by conceit. Our blessed Lord lays hold in this temple scene of all that is true and natural in the up-springing of opening youth. But it is not all conceit and wilfulness that overwhelms you. It is the instinctive motion of the growing man in you designed by God your Maker. Therefore the Lord adopts it for His own. He sets His seal upon it. As His human will found scope for its natural efforts within the sheath of His Divine will—as in the Temptation, or at Gethsemane—that will learnt obedience through suffering. So has the human intellect found force for its normal movements and discipline and expansion though held in the compass of the Divine personality. As the discipline of the will in Gethsemane was no dramatic scene, but was real to the very core, so the upward motion of His mental powers were real, vital and intense. Circumstances acted upon Him with the proper impact, and awoke the proper response, and He built up His experience out of the world about Him. He was sensitive of the play of outer things, and as He trod for the first time the Hill of Zion and passed within the glories of that dedicated house, the soul of Him, as a Jew born, awoke and stirred. A new moment was reached, and the entire manhood in Him leapt forward by this new spiritual appeal. The Evangelist lays special emphasis on the change which had been wrought, for not only are the doctors surprised at His understanding and answers, but His parents—they who knew Him so familiarly—are equally amazed. They had never known Him before like that, and never guessed where He would be found, or what He would be doing. They never suspected He assumed this prominence or displayed His powers in that fashion. They took no especial note. They relied on His constant obedience, and learned to think He was sure to live with the rest in the ordinary way. Evidently it was a sudden reversal of His habits;

He had not led them to anticipate He would do anything different from other boys. "When they saw Him they were amazed." It was a change so deep and unintelligible and not anticipated that the mother herself was startled by it into something of reproach, "Son, why hast Thou thus dealt with us?" It was so unusual. He had, until then, been at their charge and disposal, having no sign of this independence and this individual claim to freedom. "Why hast Thou thus dealt with us? Behold Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing."

My brethren, our Lord here takes up into His Divine humanity a moment in our lives which has in it a peculiar delicacy and a peculiar difficulty. He rescues our life for us from its perils. This particular moment in our growing youth is the moment in which it signalises its own independence from all that has been traditional. It is itself, and not another's. That is its discovery; it now recognises itself as it never did before; it has its own personal and private story to work, its own life to make, its joys and sorrows; its own right to its own feelings, its own hopes and thoughts, and must answer to itself, and bear its own burden, and alone it must stand before the judgment-seat of God. So it learns, in this sudden moment, a self-revelation. That must be a moral crisis for each one of us. How will we behave in it? What use do we make of this tremendous freedom? The happiness of our home life stands or falls with that decision. Too well we know in our own day the bitter wrecks of home and peace, and brotherly love and charity, which these hours of new independence have thrown upon us. Watch how our Lord Himself deals with this particular crisis of His own life. First, it is clear that He claimed His full liberty. He could not deny Himself the right to act for Himself and inquire for Himself, and to make good His own independence. The hour had struck for Him when He must break through the limitations and restraints of His childhood, and must choose His own way of going about His Father's business. He has responsibilites now towards that Father which He must fulfil, even at the cost of some severance from the tender ties of home, even at the cost of some pain to the mother whom He loved so dearly, So is this freedom which He claims the prerogative of His unique relationship to His Father. Have we no part or lot in this demand? Surely that sonship of His has been made ours; into its prerogatives we are baptised; we are given authority to become the sons of God, and we have right in the Father's house, and are charged to be about our Father's business—business with paramount demands upon us, that may have to override our father, our mother, our sister, and our brother. It may have to divide a house against itself. In His body each and every soul wins higher value than before—a further freedom and development, and judgment, and thought, and action. These are not to be lost nor diminished. They are intensified and enriched by those who are born in the spirit of liberty which bloweth as the wind, where it listeth. It is so to every one born of the Spirit.

> "These have an unction from the Holy One,
> They judge of and are judged of none."

In the Son we are made free with the freedom of the Son, and at certain special hours of life it will assert itself. But let us be sure of this, that it must heighten also the severe responsibility under which it is exercised. It is this which we are so apt to forget. Freedom! Liberty! The words sound to us as if they set us free from responsibility. Yet, claimed as they are, not in our individual capacity, but as children of God and as members of Christ's body, they must be held in trust to the Father who gave them, and the Son in whose name we act. Where did Christ betake Himself? Within what conditions does He put out this earliest freedom? He was sitting in the midst of the doctors, hearing them and asking them questions. He set free His inquiring spirit, and He did it facing the fulness of the responsibility, and bringing His inquiries in the light of the best knowledge, and laying His mind at the feet of them that sat in Moses' seat. And He not only asked the questions, but He listened—He heard them.

Ah! young hearts all aglow with new-found powers and liberty, is that the case with you? How often in the excitement of asking the first question do we forget there is need to hear what others are saying? How often in the sudden discovery of our own independence do we seem to be cut loose from every bond that binds us to others? In thinking for ourselves have we not put aside what others have thought? All men seem to have been dreaming until we arrive on the scene. At last the thing is out, and we seem carried along as if our own thoughts were sufficient of themselves, and we yield ourselves to the joy of feeling ourselves free. Yet the freedom is a trust, and we must answer for its use to the body of Christ, in and through which we acquired it; we must answer to the Father whose business it is we are about. I would ask those of you who are young, Have you brought your liberty of thought into the house of your Father? Have you taken it as a sacred charge there for Him? Have you made inquiries there, in that home, under His more immediate eye, before His altar, in grave recognition of the tremendous responsibility incurred? It is the Father's own peculiar business. That is what this liberty of yours means—not for your own fun or elation, or to startle and confuse your neighbours. No; it is your Father's own house, and you are His children in His family, called upon to so understand His deeper mind. Will it be that to you? If so, can anything be more anxious or more serious than the use you

make of it? In the sense of that seriousness have you tried at all to sit at the feet of the doctors, asking questions freely, with all your heart; seeking, as you should and as you must, to satisfy yourselves; turning to the best wisdom, searching for the best sources of the truth and getting a grip on its meaning, and understanding what you are talking about—to understand it as a whole through the lips of its ancient masters and saints; not content with a sharp retort, but listening, taking in, receiving and learning what is the splendid heritage of the Church of God, with its weighed and measured experience, built together by slow discipline into the Catholic Creed, built by those who have, through the grace of God, exercised that same freedom of thought long before you, and gone further than you, perhaps, into the height, length. depth, and breadth; and have you understood with a more ardent faith than you have yet reached that love of Christ "which passeth all understanding?" That is the question that presses home on every one who knows the liberty as it is in Christ Jesus.

One word in the course of our story to parents —to the elder generation, as again and again they find themselves facing the freedom claimed of the young. How touchingly does our story speak to them! They well remember Joseph and Mary, who went one whole day supposing the Child to be in their company. Is not that just what happens? Father and mother travel along as sure as they have before for many years. Seasons come and seasons go, and all seems quiet and smooth, and pleasant and habitual; and the parents never dream that their children are not travelling with them in their company. They never notice that they have been already a whole day without them. So little do they suspect it, that it takes three whole days before they can find them. The children, without the parents noticing it, leave them and drop out of the line. Changes have been working upon them, and long before the parents know it the severance in sympathy and feeling has been going on. Suddenly, when too late, they miss something. Things are no longer as they were, yet the parents suppose the children to be of their company. It is so easy to suppose it. But when they find what is actually the fact they are startled at recognising what has happened. They endeavour to find what it all means. How distracted and angry they are! There is no stopping with the gentle reproof of the Virgin. There are, instead, scowls and frowns, and menaces, and denunciation. The parents are so bitter, that the children are not content with what satisfied them, the father and mother. They ask why the children should trouble themselves with new-fangled inquiries? It is the cry of natural affection, and yet it is asking for an impossible thing; it is the beating of heads against the inevitable. The young can never be as the old; they must be under new influences and impressions, hearing new things and feeling their way forward. As their fathers did, so they will do. All are pilgrims, they are all moving on. Their tents must be taken up every morning and carried to a fresh camp; they have fresh adventure and fresh knowledge. They may carry the old truth of God's mercy, but it will still be in new places. They are young, they are new; they cannot be wholly what we were. They have something to think for God and to do for Christ. They are young, and youth is a sacred thing. It must go about its Father's business. It may be they are a headstrong and arbitrary people, but there must be something which we must not interfere with. There is a point at which we must fall back and be satisfied to watch and pray—to watch, not going on supposing that our children are still of our company when they are not. We must watch, and look round so as never to lose them without noticing it—just to take notice when the change begins and not forget that they are growing up. We must watch and be near at hand to help with a sympathetic word and look, and pressure of the hand now and then. Those things may do wonders. There must be no blindness and no stupid anger. We must watch opportunities, anticipating the change, recognising that it must come, taking careful measures to satisfy rising intellect, watching the growing souls of the children. "Watch, and then pray." Prayer is far more effective than any of our arguments, and certainly more than our anger. Pray, above all, when the crisis is at the worst, when the child seems swept away by false doctrine. It is far better, then, to pray in patience than to do anything that wearies the poor troubled soul. "Watch and pray," and recall for your comfort, over and over again, the story of that wise old bishop, to whom the blessed mother of Augustine turned in anguish over her unsteady son. She begged of the bishop to argue with him, but he was unwilling, "for," he said, "at this moment he is unteachable and inflated by the excitement of his new theory; only leave him alone and just pray to God for him; he will find out his mistake in time for himself, if you pray." And when she could not acquiesce, but still implored him to see her son and talk with him, the bishop at last, with a touch of irritation, said: "Go away and live in your present spirit, for it cannot be that any son by such tears as yours will ever perish." Recall that story and remember that it was the mother who by her tears and prayers won for the Western Church her great faith.

BISHOP J. H. WILKINSON (late of Truro), whose health has greatly improved, sailed on Saturday for South Africa, to pay a short visit to the dioceses of Capetown and Grahamstown. He requests that letters may be addressed to him at the Athenæum Club, Pall Mall, S.W.

"PREACHING THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST."

By Rev. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER, M.A., LL.D., Summer Chaplain at Holy Trinity, Pau, France.

Sermon Preached on Sunday, May 15th, 1892.

"Preaching the Gospel of Christ."—2 Cor. x. 14.

I MAY state without fear of contradiction that the whole moral want of a wicked world is supplied by the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The preaching of that Gospel is God's appointed means for the reformation and salvation of our ruined race.

The end fulfilled by the preaching of that Gospel is manifested in the man who, having heard the Word, heeds it, and having received it with an honest and good heart, brings forth fruit with patience.

To prove these postulates in their order. For the proof of the first one, let us cast our minds back upon the world of mankind existing in pre-Christian centuries, and then project our thoughts towards those remote lands of to-day, where the worship of heathenkind is even more savage than are the breasts of its votaries; and whether we contemplate the gloomy past of ancient heathendom, disfigured by the shadows of cruel superstitions with their train of attendant vices, or whether we observe the existence of superstitions as cruel and vices as gross, in modern heathen lands, as any disfiguring their ancient archetypes, what a mass of evidence do we accumulate, proving from the wickedness of the world, of the past and of the present, the existence of a great moral want. Does not this mass of evidence conclusively prove that the moral want of the Gospel of righteousness has existed from all times and among all peoples? It emphatically does. And as no Gospel but that of Jesus Christ can be shown to be the one of highest spiritual worship, of finest moral purity, and of perfect peace and good will towards men, by sequence, it follows—that His Gospel alone is able to supply the whole moral want of a wicked world. To make the heathen of to-day sensible of their great moral need, well may the Christian envoy cry to them, as St. Paul exclaimed to the Lycaonian idolaters: "Why, sirs, do ye these things?"—and add, "We preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God." To supply them with the alone antidote for the depraving infections of humanity, he must lead them to those grace-welling fonts, whose purifying waters flow freely from the Gospel Head, Jesus Christ.

The second postulate, that the preaching of the Gospel is God's appointed means for the salvation of our ruined race is primarily attested by the Tongue of God which cannot lie: "The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Romans i. 16). And secondarily it is attested by the fact, that when any man accepts and utilises these appointed means, he secures the end they are designed to attain, namely, the power of God unto his own soul's salvation.

The end fulfilled by the preaching of the Gospel is manifested, when we observe men, or communities, surrender themselves to its influence, and by the mysterious potency of its Divine force become converted from moral deformity to spiritual beauty. This conversion fulfils the object of the proclamation of the Gospel, which is to save mankind from self-degradation, and a wicked world from moral anarchy. Its final *aim* is accomplished when the brute nature shall be exorcised from a man's being, that his Divine original image may reshine with the sheen of magnified glory. Then shall be re-edified by the Hand of its Almighty Architect the ruined temple of human nature, re-edified and perpetuated with spiritual material which shall give it an everlasting stability.

The Gospel can be preached in various ways. It can be instilled by love, which is the noblest method of proclaiming the Word of God—by love all-comprehensive, as our Saviour taught it on the Mount, and as the beloved Apostle in his record delivers the discourses of Jesus. The same gentle Apostle inculcates throughout his three Epistles the Gospel of love, of love pure and simple, with scarcely a harsh word and but few reproving expressions.

The Gospel can also be delivered by reproof and by argument, as our Lord published it to the hypocritical Pharisees, and as St. Paul set it forth to the sophistical Corinthians. Both the great Teacher and His faithful monitor to the Gentiles, St. Paul, unhesitatingly wielded the thong of severe reproof, and dealt the thrust of solid argument; with the one cutting through and through the hardened integument of hypocrisy, and with the other felling to the ground the champions of false doctrine. And preaching the Gospel by reproof is, in very truth, preaching it in love, because "whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." And further, an inspired proverb declares, "Reproofs of instruction are the ways of life;" and again, "He that refuseth reproof erreth" (Proverbs vi. 23; x. 17). The inspired ideas of St. Paul of the manner in which the ordained servant of God should deliver the Gospel message are very plainly stated. To Timothy he writes: "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." To Titus, whose ministrations lay amongst the lying and otherwise ill-famed Cretans, the command runs: "By sound doctrine both to exhort and convince the gainsayers"; and also, "Wherefore rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith."

And how shall I illustrate those who preach the

Gospel by argument? Are they not the well-disciplined soldiers of the Captain of our salvation—the vanguard of His Church militant—who, having taken up arms for His cause, advance and give warning to the main body, of the enemy's approach and movements, that battle may be given as skill dictates, either by forming to defend or by charging to attack? Having large experience in the tactics of the enemies of the Gospel, and being expert masters of the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, they are able to frustrate and confound the designs of their foes, and often beat them with their own weapons, and rout them off their own chosen ground. Christ, by argument, confounded the foes of His Gospel so completely, that "no man durst ask Him any more questions." And St. Paul, whom the eminent Locke considered the ablest reasoner that ever lived, shattered to pieces the sophisms of his Corinthian opponents (and that, too, upon the ground of their own showing), and, like Samson before he retired to Etam, smote the unbelievers both "hip and thigh."

Preaching by argument is absolutely necessary. How does any minister of the Gospel know whether some who are sitting in God's sanctuary may not be darkling in half doubt, if they be not actually dark in whole doubt, concerning doctrines whereof they do not apprehend the nature and strength of the reasons for their maintenance? How is the Gospel to be promulgated to the man whose doubt is the offspring of ignorance; and how are its truths to be made to oust the fallacies which possess the mind of the misled, prejudiced doubter? I fail to perceive any other mode than by argument, based upon evidence scriptural and natural, after the manner in which Christ and His Apostles reasoned. Do not the ranks of doubters recruit with every new generation of men? and do not new doubts successively arise to becloud the bright pavilion that spans the Gospel of God's benevolence to man? Nevertheless, the providence of God is alike able and willing to supply new, original methods for resolving doubts, whether such doubts proceed from new-fangled or trite forms of unbelief. Let Christian philosophers continue to unlock the arcana of nature with the key of science and research; for God's evidence for Himself and the benignity of His rule is stored up in the treasury of His works, as well as in the treasury of His Word.

Why is the Christian preacher bound to argue for the glorious Gospel of the living God? What should be His dearest motive for doing so? What His paramount aim in so doing? His dearest motive should be, not the love of controversy, but the love of God; and His paramount aim should be, not self-magnification, but the glory of God in the defence of His truth; for every phase of Gospel preaching centres in love, and God who is love is glorified by truth. Nothing pierces doubt in the mind of the unbeliever so keenly as the well-aimed shaft of argument, speeded by the unerring grace of God. Doubt is the devil's rampart, behind which he lurks to manœuvre his dupes; and the devil's rampart must be laid siege to, stormed, and taken by assault of argument, before we can expect the citadel to capitulate, and its occupants made, like St. Paul, prisoners of Jesus Christ and in bonds for His sake.

God disseminates the manna of His grace in divers ways, according to the need of the soul of every individual starving in the wilderness of sin for the Bread of Life; it is sown in the kindly soil of the simple-hearted by the gentle hand of love; it is furrowed into the flinty ground, the conscience of the law-breaker and worldling, by the ploughshare of reproof; and it is planted in the stubborn soil, the mind of the doubter, by the instrumentality of argument.

Gentle natures are often won to Christ by simple words of Gospel love, that strike the chords of human sympathy and attune the soul for evermore to Jesus' love. Preaching through love fills the tender-hearted with a longing desire to become the recipients of that wondrous love, which floods the highest heavens, and yet is willing to home itself in the humble heart. Callous world-lovers, overtaken by grief and misfortunes, the fickle world no longer reciprocating their love for its attractions, often feel their wasted, disappointed lives to be so many heavy reproofs; and, weary and heavy laden, seek refuge and repose in a cleft of the Rock of Ages. To them comes with clinching effect the truth of Christ's reproof—"Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." Preaching through reproof arouses the conscience to the performance of the spiritual functions which it holds in trust for God; one of which functions is to assert God's claim upon the entire moral and spiritual obedience of the man, and another to be sensible of having disregarded those Divine claims. And if the Holy Spirit implant in the heart the holy desire and purpose of obedience to those claims, the Divine gift of grace descending converts the sinner's godly sorrow for sin into the saint's godly joy of salvation. But for doubters, among whom, without doubt, many of the chosen of Christ are to be found, the appointed instruments for their conversion are decidedly argument and proof. The doubt of the Apostle Thomas his Divine Master condescended to resolve by the acme of argument,—demonstration. Thomas doubted a physical fact of the Gospel, our Lord's Resurrection: Christ's method of persuading a doubter of a physical fact was to reason him out of his doubt by natural proofs incontestable. In like manner are objectors to Gospel truths to be argued out of their objections by reasonable proofs. For, the Christian minister must be willing to lead men to Christ in the way they are minded to come to Him. Once the doubter beholds his

risen, living Saviour, and touches the nail prints of His crucifixion, no longer faithless but believing, he will cry like Thomas in the joy of his heart, "My Lord and my God!" Faith shall spring from one real view, one true touch of Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith.

Now the preaching of the Gospel specifically delegated to the ministry, is one of instruction in righteousness and doctrine, and exhortation to holiness of life; a full proclamation of the gospel of repentance, the gospel of faith, and the gospel of good works. And yet these are not three not gospels, but one Gospel. For good works cannot be done (works can) without faith preceding them; and faith cannot exist without repentance preceding it. Not one of these three can exist without the other; and if any one of these triune gifts of grace is truly possessed, they are each and all possessed effectually, for each one is the outcome and development of the others. Our Lord's life is an epitome of instruction in righteousness, and doctrine, and exhortation to holiness of life. The Great Preacher's biography forms a whole series of standard sermons, wherein are displayed all the ways of unfolding the beauties of the Divine message to man. His good exhortations of example never tire; they are as delightful to our contemplation as they are profitable for our imitation. Never is the heavenly way of righteousness so forcibly indicated as by holding up the example of Him Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. And, let it be remembered, that only the righteous, according to law and Gospel, have the undisputed right of way to eternal life, and so much so, that Satan himself will not be permitted to file a demurrer to this their inalienable right in Christ Jesus.

Upon all Christians the obligation is laid of propagating the Gospel of Christ, for they are all priests to God. The majority of Christians are not set apart by the laying on of hands of the ministry to preach the Word of Life; but the Gospel can be promoted by the laity as the holy men and women who followed our Lord and His Apostles, delighted to minister in it, by example of a holy life; by ministering to the necessity of the sick and poor; by feeding the young with the milk of doctrine, as Lois and Eunice fed the child Timothy; and by feeding the poor and oppressed with the milk of human kindness. The laity can also promote the Gospel by taking a sincere and disinterested part in the work of their own parish in particular, and also by evincing a warm-hearted practical interest in the affairs of the Church at large, both in the home and mission fields. By the distribution of good, well chosen books and tracts, treating of the religion of Jesus; and by other means a thousand-fold, the laity, each man according to his onus and opportunity, can plant and nurture the good seed of the Gospel, depending upon the All-giver for the pledged and certain increase. Hearer, you who hear and heed in earnest, do you ask me how you can personally best scatter the Gospel-seed of eternal life? I answer you, when you meet a thoughtless, heedless soul, speak to such an one in the most loving, persuasive words of the gentle Saviour; when you meet a world-lover bewailing worldly loss, remind him that there is a better Gospel than the gospel of gain; and you who have the grace of faith, when thereto you have added the gift of reasoning, when you meet a doubter, breathing a prayer to the Divine Spirit for aid, try to reason the dupe of doubt into the wisdom of a full belief. And thus each one of us, accordingly as God has equipped us with opportunity, knowledge, and faith, is bound to proclaim the glorious Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE INTROIT OF THE SOUL.

III.—Love.

By the Rev. S. J. SYKES, B.A., Curate of Lower Mitton, Stourport, Worcestershire.

Sermon Preached at Astley Parish Church, on Sunday, January 31st, 1892.

"He that loveth not knoweth not God."—1 John iv. 8.

Love has a threefold part to play in human life and conduct. It is the motive force of our best actions; it is the beautifying and brightening shaft of light across the ofttimes clouded sky of an earthly existence; it is a rod of wholesome discipline in the hand of God.

Consider it under these three aspects—first, as the motive and inspiration of what is best in our thoughts, words, and works.

It is necessary here to premise that we cannot degrade the word "love" to that ignoble use of it which appears in the word "self-love." Self-love is a contradiction—an impossibility. For love means a feeling of attraction towards, a sympathetic regard for, an inclination to, something or somebody. And in every attraction, there is of necessity the attracting and the attracted; in sympathy, there must be the sympathiser and the object of sympathy; in inclination, it is impossible for anything to incline or lean towards itself. Love is essentially the going out of the soul from self, the casting forth of kindly regards from self, like beams shot from some centre of light. So soon, therefore, as this wonderful force changes its object from without to within, so soon as it returns to self, instead of expending itself upon other, it ceases to be love, and becomes the very antithesis of love, that is, selfishness.

I. Love, then, is the motive of our best activity. In truth

> "All thoughts, all passions, all delights,
> Whatever stirs this mortal frame,
> Are but the ministers of love,
> And feed his sacred flame."

The flame of love is always a sacred one, for it is

the flame in man's heart that is kindled by a living coal from heaven's altar. God is Love, and in so far as man acts under that inspiration, he is reflecting that Divine image in whose likeness he originally was created. When his thought is one of love, it is the Divine Mind thinking in him; when his words are words of love, it is the breath of God that passes his lips; when his deeds are deeds of love, the hand of the creature and the Hand of the Creator are moving to one purpose. Is not this an exalting thought? It is ever the glory of man to be strong. Then let him seek by prayer the spirit of love, and he has all strength behind him; his hand is locked in the Hand that guides the stars. It is ever the glory of woman to be beautiful. Would she attain to the highest type and ideal of womanly beauty? Let her seek by prayer the spirit of love, and the Author of all the harmonies of the universe, the Fountain of all beauty, dwells in her and quickens and informs her influence. No man need be other than strong, no woman need be other than beautiful; for God has revealed to us His own Divine character, and bidding us make it our ideal and example, has shown us how we may win our place in His loving heart, and thereby quicken the pulsation of our own.

It is to this aspect of love that our Prayer-book makes reference when it bids us examine ourselves, and see that we be in love and charity with all men, before we presume to partake of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. The discords that our petty passions beget must be hushed; the antagonism to the Divine nature that our unchecked envy, hatred, malice and uncharitableness sets up, must be quelled; the mind of man must be tuned, so far as may be, to the Divine harmonies, before we may presume to eat of that bread, to drink of that cup. Faith, Repentance, and Love are the notes in that chord of human music that is grateful to the ear of God; and indeed, so wondrously has the Creator framed the instrument of the heart of man, that it is not possible to sound one without striking into vibration the other strings also. If there be true faith, there must be repentance and love; if there be true repentance, there must be faith and love; if there be true love, there must be faith and repentance.

> We live in deeds, not years;
> In thoughts, not breaths;
> In feelings, not in figures on a dial.
> We should count time by heart-throbs,
> For he most lives
> Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best.

True, indeed! and as food is no use save to the living, so it is meet that that life for which the Lord God framed our souls, the life of high, pure, holy thoughts, feelings, and desires, should be quickened in us before we presume to feast upon the heavenly and living food; before we dare breathe a prayer that it may be for our soul's health. Faith is the turning of the soul's vision upward to God; repentance is the turning of the soul's vision inward upon self; but love is the glancing of a beam from the Mercy Seat into the soul, through it (like light passing through a prism) to fall with softened beauty upon the world. So the Lord Christ took the widow, and for her two mites—the gift of love—lifted her into the gaze of nations, and threw around her a halo of glory brighter than kings' diadems.

II. But besides the inspiring motive of our best aims, love is the sunlight, as it were, of life's day. From the rays that brood above the wakening dawn of childhood, while yet we are pressing forward to look at life over the hill-tops of time, from the stronger heat of the noonday beams of manhood and womanhood's affections, to the softened hues of the light at evening-tide, when heads are whitened with the snows of many winters, but hearts are still warm with summer glow—throughout the day of life, it is love that frets the sky with those lines of light that make it beautiful. And this for two reasons,—first, because it is unselfishness; and, secondly, because through its character of unselfishness, it is the sole spring of contentment. You know well that, quite apart from any will of our own, the moments which give us most pleasure in retrospect are those which have been moments of unselfishness. It is a great condition of our nature, fixed by the God who is Love, that it shall find no lasting gladness in mere selfishness. Does the sensualist, when the fires of his sensualism are reduced to the cold dead ashes of remembrance, find pleasure in the memory of their fevered heat? Does the profligate thrill with gladness in recalling his profligacy? Miser or spendthrift, is either happy as he leaves the warm precincts of the cheerful day and casts one longing, lingering look behind? My brethren, there is but one answer to such questions, and upon it spendthrift and sensualist, profligate and miser, will be in perfect agreement. Unselfishness alone can fret the cloud with light.

And, to carry the analysis one step further, it is largely so because unselfishness is the only spring of that contentment which is the golden key to happiness. It is a fact too little recognised by those who confuse such diverse things as money and happiness, that God has largely equalised thus the distribution of happiness in the world. Any one, by cultivating contentment, can bring himself within reach of happiness: no one, without contentment, can possibly attain to it. This point I must leave without worthy illustration, for time fails me to pursue it as it deserves; but allow me to leave with you Carlyle's pregnant remark (quoted from memory) which bears upon it.

"If all the Kings, Emperors, Governments, Councils of this planet, or all planets where such exist, should lay their heads together and combine in an attempt to make one shoe-black perfectly happy, they could not do it."

III. Lastly, the power of love is a rod of discipline in the hand of God. Experience of earth

and her tale soon teaches us that sympathy which is born of love is a beautiful gift from God, but a painful one. In palace or hut, in the breast of prince or pauper, much of the agony that is endured springs from love, sympathy, affection, friendship. These are like the nerves in the sum-total of the moral powers of men. How they thrill with pleasure—how they quiver with pain! To see—as often falls to human lot to see—the strong and vigorous life stricken in a moment into weakness and death, the promise cut off, the possibilities denied; or to watch the young and fresh vitality growing old and feeble and worn, to realise that life brings changes as well as death—is not this pain, yet the very discipline of God, could we but know it? Ah, we feel the pain; if we believe that God is Love, we must believe His discipline to be wholesome and kind. We all know the pain of love. Small wonder that the words which ever find the quickest, most fervent, most real response in the breasts of worshippers should be those in which we commend to His Fatherly goodness all those who are any ways afflicted or distressed in mind, body, or estate; beseeching that it may please Him to give them patience under their sufferings and a happy issue out of all their afflictions.

But, brethren, it need not be death that brings the sharpest, keenest agony. I met with some pathetic lines the other day which will show you what I mean. They were attributed to Hood, but are not, I think, to be found in his published works. The verses are addressed to his wife:—

> "Ah, dearest, if our tears were shed
> Only for our beloved—dead,
> Although our life's left incomplete,
> Tears would not be so bitter, sweet,
> As now—ah, no!
>
> "Ah, dearest, if the friends who die
> Alone were those who make us sigh,
> Although life's current is so fleet,
> Sighs would not be so weary, sweet,
> As now—ah, no!
>
> "If oft more pain it did not give
> To know that our beloved live,
> Than learn their hearts have ceased to beat,
> Grief would not be so hopeless, sweet,
> As now—ah, no!"

Sometimes the bursting heart vents the cry: Would that my child had died in the innocence of infancy! There is the sharpest pain of love.

Seeing then, brethren, that as love is the beauty, so it is the discipline of life: as it gives the pain, so it gives the pleasure, let us thankfully accept at the hand of God that which the wisdom of His Love has ordered; praying Him that as the discipline and pain are needed only in a world of sin, He may hasten His kingdom and bring near the day when His will shall be done in earth as it is in heaven, and love shall be only the gladdening and ennobling impulse and inspiration to whatsoever is good—the only source of beauty, and a joy for ever!

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1892.

BEGGING.

At last the police have made a move, and one or two of the persistent touters for halfpence, who are the nuisance of London, have been arrested. We hope this zeal will not be still-born. For years past mendicancy has been getting worse and worse in London. All the summer round legions of street musicians, tub-thumpers, casual "askers," and touts of every description make our streets a howling wilderness, literally. It is actually impossible to walk half a mile in any direction in London without being, on some pretext or other, asked for money. The parks are worst of all—a quiet evening stroll in them is hopeless, at every corner, and on every grass-plot, there is a "collection" going on for something.

It is true that the laws concerning mendicancy were not aimed at these offenders, simply because they have not been always with us; they are a recent development—and not a desirable one. But if the present statutes cannot touch them, we ought to have some that can. A citizen of London ought to be able to go freely about his business without being molested, and from most kinds of annoyance he can find legal protection; surely he is not to be permanently exposed to this?

But it is very doubtful whether the present laws do not suffice. Whatever class of beggars was predominant at the time of the Acts suppressing medicancy, the root idea of those Acts was to suppress begging as well as beggars. It ought not to protect a rascal, as it does now, who makes a flimsy pretence of supplying value for money. The music of the barrel organ and the gutter vocalist may have charms for some people, who express their gratitude in pence. At all events wheeling and grinding a big piano organ is not an idle life. But what sane man can ascribe any value to the

performances of the touting gabblers in the park. These "lectures," "recitations" and "sermons" are not only perfectly worthless, even when they are not pernicious in themselves, but they have involved no labour. They are simply a cover for the begging by which the loafers in sham academic gowns support themselves. No one who has ever listened for a few minutes to them could suppose otherwise. There will always be a certain number of men and women to whom any kind of work is distasteful, and since they must get a living somehow, they adopt that particular form of idleness which is congenial to them—some prefer the excitement of crime, some the lesser triumphs of petty larcenies and cheats, some choose the uneven tenor of the gutter song, some, gifted with long tongues, prefer to exercise the mischievous faculty of excessive speech. All alike are idle, worthless vagabonds who have discovered that an indulgent society will support them in idleness, and so long as they find that to be the case, they intend to remain idle. Monkeys are said to refuse to talk lest they should be made to work; mendicants refuse to work for fear they should have to stop talking. A good long spell of solitary confinement would probably have a salutary effect.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." June, 1892. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

PROBABLY most readers will be impressed with Bishop Westcott's calm, judicialdefence of the Revised Version. His paper is also a quiet rebuke to the eagerness of this hasty generation. It took fifty years and more for the Authorised Version—which, by the way, never was authorised—to thoroughly establish itself, and we in our thoughtlessness condemn the R. V. because it has not superseded the A. V. in somewhere about a third of that time.

"Bed or Staff" has interested us very much. We are not prepared at once to adopt the meaning that Jacob worshipped towards the head of his, *i.e. Joseph's*, Staff, the symbol of high authority, and that when he did so he "might well remember his own incredulous question, Shall I indeed come to bow down myself to thee to the earth?"—but we have made a note of it. On the other hand we cannot accept the idea that Barabbas was the "scapegoat"; far too fanciful.

WE have received from Messrs. Nisbet the May number of the *Treasury*, an American publication.

As an example of the increased use which is now being made of the Church House by the Church abroad, it may be mentioned that the Bishop of Grahamstown, who is desirous of forming a diocesan guild as a means of binding the Church people of his scattered diocese more closely together, has applied to the secretary for information as to the best rules to be adopted by such a guild.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION.

SIR,—I am still away from home, and can only reply in an incomplete way to the observations of "Vindex" in Saturday's PULPIT.

I think it is of great importance that all who engage in serious controversy should conscientiously observe the rules of equity and strict accuracy when they refer to statements made by opponents. No class of misrepresentations can possibly advance the cause of truth, but may often produce useless annoyances, as well as waste of time and thought.

By the term "intelligent beings," I mean not only the human race, but all spiritual natures, whether sinless or sinful, such as I understand when I say "the intelligent universe," or "the intelligent creation," as distinguished from "the brute creation."

The adjectives which accompany the scriptural words *destruction* and *to perish*, do not mean endless or irreversible. For this we have the authority of eminent Christian writers in the early centuries. They evidently did not believe that the sin against the Holy Ghost would never be forgiven. Our translators were evidently not infallible men.

I have given my conception of the condition and occupation of the redeemed in a future life. Let "Vindex" state what conception he has on that interesting topic. The gloomy tenets of those who are called orthodox have actually made the idea of heaven so unattractive, that few preachers seem bold enough to refer to it, and most of them avoid any direct allusion to hell.

I do not charge "Vindex" with stating that the eternal destruction of the finally impenitent is a result of the scheme of redemption, and my words do not bear such a meaning. I charge him with not perceiving that Christ died to secure universal deliverance from sin, and universal reconciliation with God. I hold that the Scriptures plainly declare that none will be endlessly ruined and destroyed, either in the sense of annihilation, or of endless suffering and endless sin.

I do not myself believe the punishments in a future life will be more severe or of longer duration than the principles of justice and retribution demand, and the welfare of those punished requires.

As far as I can understand the ideas of Vindex and others of his school of thought, cremation on the largest conceivable scale is, and will be, constantly annihilating or destroying the greater part of what God has created, spirit as well as matter. The impression produced on me is, of terrible wrecks and ruins, with dreary loneliness throughout, contrasted with most inopportune and even indecent, heartless joy. I, on the other hand, thankfully believe that everything noxious and evil will be transformed into good.

There are most painful contrasts in the conditions and experience of men in this life, as also in the future life. All I have seen and known, as well as the declarations of Scripture convince me of this. But I can also perceive important reasons, and the working-out of most beneficent purposes in such a state of things; all under the guidance of Divine wisdom, rectitude, and love, and destined to work out universal good. It ought not to be kept out of sight, that many of those who we believe are among the elect have

prolonged and acute suffering in this life—"Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." There is a passage indicating that some of the elect will be saved "so as by fire."

I have no anxiety, nor even the slightest wish to get rid of the delightfulness of believing in my absolute dependence on the Creator.

I quoted Locke as regards freedom of the will, but was not aware of his opinions on future destinies.

Canonbury, 6th June, 1892. J. B.

THE arrangements for the S.P.G. anniversary are :—The service in St. Paul's on Wednesday next wil consist (as usual) of a choral celebration of the Holy Communion, with a sermon by Canon Jacob, vicar of Portsea. The meeting to-morrow week in St. James's Hall, at 2.30 p.m., falls upon the exact anniversary of the actual day of the society's first corporate existence under Royal Charter, June 16th, 1701. The Archbishop of Canterbury will take the chair, and speeches are also promised from the Bishop of Mashonaland (Dr. Knight-Bruce), the Bishop of Saskatchewan and Calgary (Dr. Pinkham), the Bishop of Trinidad (Dr. Hayes), Sir Arthur H. Gordon (formerly Governor of Trinidad, Mauritius, Fiji, New Zealand, and Ceylon), and the Rev. W. H. Hutchings, rector of Kirkby Misperton.

AT the dinner of the Sunday Evening Choir of St. Paul's Cathedral some weeks back, Canon Scott Holland, referring to the future plans for the decoration of St. Paul's, mentioned that the font would probably be surrounded by a marble baldacchino. The London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* learns that this plan has been abandoned by the Dean and chapter, and at the present moment there is at Messrs. Farmer and Brindley's a model of the magnificent font cover, which it is proposed to erect in bronze, and which will resemble the best specimens of Florentine work. The cover will be suspended from the roof, and will be of great height, with Scriptural designs of baptismal scenes ; whilst around the font itself will be a marble screen or wall, of different colours, resembling as much as possible the font surroundings of Ravenna.

THIS last week has been rich in lectures of interest at Oxford. Professor Max Müller lectured on Tuesday and Thursday on Esoteric Buddhism, Professor W. M. Ramsay at Mansfield Cottage on the relations of the Early Church to the Imperial Bureaucracy. In his first lecture Professor Max Müller dealt chiefly with India as the home of mystery, of forgeries, and deceptions of all kinds. Starting with quite early days, he illustrated by numerous historical examples, some quaint, some curious, the part which deception and fraud has played in the life of the peoples of India. Madame Blavatsky, herself originally the victim of one of these frauds, came, perhaps unconsciously, as time went on, to share in and to give countenance to them. For in truth an esoteric Buddhism, he explained in his second lecture, was an impossibility. Buddha himself in his system emphatically repudiated mystery and miracle ; all with him was simple, plain, straightforward. Brahminism itself, on which his teaching was based, was equally direct : the Vedas, its sacred books, have nothing mystic or mysterious about them ; the very necessity which the inventors of esoteric Buddhism found themselves under to place the home of their doctrine beyond the Himalayas is a proof how little there was in Buddhism, as professed and practised in India itself, which could give countenance to its mysterious pretensions. In conclusion the Professor alluded to the completion of his task of editing the Sacred Books of the East, and gracefully tendered his thanks to the University and the Government of India, who had combined together to supply him with the necessary means and time to carry out this important work. We hope we may not be considered hypercritical if we venture to express regret that there were not more representatives of the University present to listen to and acknowledge the Professor's eloquent words. Would it be too much to expect that one or two heads of houses should have devoted one hour of their abundant leisure to listening to one of Oxford's brightest ornaments lecture on a subject of considerable speculative interest and some practical importance. What gave their great interest to Professor Ramsay's lectures was not only his obvious mastery and grasp of his subject, but also the extent to which, by his researches amid the inscriptions of Asia Minor, he was able to throw new and important fresh light upon it.

PROFESSOR SANDAY'S appointment as Bampton Lecturer for next year has given general satisfaction in Oxford, and people will wait with much interest to hear what he has to say upon the burning question of inspiration, which he has selected as his subject. What he will have to say is sure to be marked by that sobriety of judgment, width of view, and conscientious truthfulness which have distinguished all his work.

THE Bangor Diocesan Conference will take place towards the end of September at Blaenau Festiniog. The following are the subjects which have been selected for discussion :—

1. How the Church can best safeguard her interests in elementary, intermediate, and higher education.
2. The Church in relation to Welsh national sentiment.
3. How the Church can best meet the needs of rural and populous districts.
4. The best means to be adopted by the Church for the instruction of the people in—(*a*) Church history ; (*b*) higher religious truths.

In the evening a public meeting will be held, when the following questions will be the topics :—

1. The example of our Lord manifested in His ministers as a means of elevation to the whole body of the faithful.
2. Method and definiteness in the spiritual life.

TWO Methodist ministers, the Rev. F. Chester and the Rev. T. Plank, have just resigned their appointments with a view to taking orders in the Church of England.

THE *Manchester Guardian* says that the Rev. Berdmore Compton, formerly vicar of All Saints', Margaret Street, has resigned his membership of the English Church Union and his seat on the Council.

THE Rev. Henry Houssemayne Du Boulay, B.A., Vicar of Newlyn, Hon. Canon of Truro, Proctor in Convocation for the Chapter of Truro, and editor of *Truro Diocesan Calendar* has accepted the rectory of Lawhitton, offered him by the Bishop of Truro.

THE Rev. W. Norris, for over fifty years rector of Warblington, celebrated his ninety-seventh birthday last Tuesday week. The *Hampshire Chronicle* says that Mr. Norris is still in the enjoyment of good health. He graduated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1816, and was ordained in 1818.

THE *Lichfield Diocesan Magazine* says that the announcement of the intended resignation by the Dean

of the office he has held in the Cathedral for seventeen years has been received with universal regret. "As, however, it is understood that his resignation will not take effect for some three or four months, it seems premature to give at present in the official organ of the diocese expression to such remarks as the occasion will call forth."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Awdry, Rev. Canon William, M.A., Vicar of Amport; Rural Dean of Andover.
Blagden, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Hughenden; Hon. Canon of Christ Church Oxford.
Blunt, Rev. Canon, A.C., M.A., Rector of Burghclere; Rural Dean of Kingsclere.
Cole, Rev. W. Alston, M.A., Rector of East Lockinge; Chaplain to Lord Wantage.
Cowley, Rev. W. D., D.D.; Perpetual Curate of St. John's Chapel, Chichester.
Cullin, Rev. J. M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Upper Clapton.
Davis, Rev. Edwin, M.A., Lecturer at the Parish Church, Halifax; Assistant Organising Secretary of the English Church Union for the Diocese of Ripon and Wakefield.
Du Boulay, Rev. Henry Houssemayn, B.A., Vicar of Newlyn, Hon. Canon of Truro; Rector of Lawhitton, Cornwall.
Firth, Rev. W. W. D., M.A., formerly Curate of Lancaster; Licensed to Officiate in the diocese of Liverpool.
Haslam, Rev. John H., M.A., Rector of Gravesend; Surrogate for the Diocese of Rochester.
Hollings, Rev. E. R.; Vicar of St. John's Bethnal Green.
Holt; Rev. G. O., Rector of Whittington, Chesterfield, Vicar of Great Haywood, Stafford.
Inman, Rev. Canon Edward, M.A., Vicar of Potterne; Rural Dean of Potterne Portion.
Lawrence, Rev. Charles D'Aguilar, M.A., Rector of Lowestoft, Suffolk; Rural Dean of Lothingland.
Ling, Rev. Henry Pratt, M.A.; Rector of Stanton on the Wolds, Notts.
Milward, Rev. William Carlisle Sayer, M.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chichester.
Nicholas, Rev. E. P., M.A., Vicar of Worfield, Bridgnorth; Rural Dean of Trysul.
Orford, Rev. H. W., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leicester; Surrogate for the Diocese of Peterborough.
Pereira, Rev. H. H., M.A., Rector of Chilbolton; Rural Dean of Stockbridge.
Stephenson, Rev. John M.A., Vicar of Boston; Chaplain of the Workhouse.
Swindell, Rev. F. S., M.A., Vicar of Erdington; Surrogate for the Diocese of Worcester.
Tanner, Rev. Charles Noble, M.A., Rector of Bruntingthorpe. Leicestershire.
Tudor, Rev. W. L., Curate of St. Michael's, Neepsend, Sheffield; Vicar of St. Jude's, Moorfields, Sheffield.
Van, Rev. Henry John Freake, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Sydling St. Nicholas, Dorset.
Workman, Rev. Arthur William, M.A., Vicar of Grasby, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cooper, Rev. Thomas Lovick, for nearly sixty-one years Rector of Empingham, at Empingham Rectory, on the 29th ult., aged 90.
Edmondes, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Honorary Canon of Llandaff, and Vicar of Llanblethian and Cowbridge. 1835-1883, at Cowbridge, on the 2nd inst., aged 85 years and 11 months.
Goodhart, Rev. Charles Joseph, for twenty-four years Rector of the Parish, formerly Incumbent of Park Chapel Chelsea, Hon. Sec. of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, at Wetherden, on the 28th ult., aged 88.
Rawson, Rev. Edward Octavius, M.A., at Ince Vicarage, near Chester, on the 3rd inst., aged 40.
Rigg, Rev. W., late Head Master of Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Kingston-on-Thames, at Bowes, on the 25th ult., aged 70.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies of hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

The Church of England Pulpit.

TWO OF CHRIST'S VISIONS.

By the Rev. Canon H. SCOTT-HOLLAND.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday, May 15th, 1892.

"The disciple whom Jesus loved . . . . which also leaned on His breast at supper, and said: Lord, which is he that betrayeth Thee?"—John xxi. 20.

HOW could he ever forget it — he who had lain on the lap of Jesus? Across all the long years he looked back and saw it clear. He had lain on Jesu's lap. Actually it had once been true. So long ago now, and so many things had happened, it might begin to seem incredible that that it ever could have occurred. The lights might seem to flicker, the world grow unsteady, but all the more did he fasten to that supreme experience. Many other things might drop away and be lost, but this one thing he would fix and repeat and cling to, as the cardinal point round which all his other memories should turn—the emphatic proof of his authority as a witness, the brand of his peculiar significance stamping him as an apostle of unique and solitary character. So it had become his title to speak, the mark by which he was to be known—the one who lay on Jesu's breast. He needs no other name. For the world he might be called John, but to the faithful in his Gospel he is simply to be known by the fact that on that last night of his Master on earth he lay where none might lie—he whom Jesus loved. So he named himself in the Gospel, so the name passed down into Christian tradition in its most beautiful form, "a bosom friend," "the man who leaned on the bosom." How the sound came back to him as he so named himself! The very temper and tone, the atmosphere of that hour, flooded around him with the sound. What was it that it chiefly recalled? It was that moment of horror and panic when the Lord Himself was shaken with the bitter agony of the betrayal; a storm of emotion suddenly passed over Him, so that He could not proceed with His talk, but broke off short. He had been preparing His chosen friends for a special revelation by the washing of feet, and His whole heart had been bent forward in that last act of love by which to pledge His love to them for ever to the uttermost in the gift of the body and blood, and His spirit was now ready to pour out those silent utterances which should be His dying will and covenant to His bride the Church. This hour of all hours, when the Son was glorified, when all the Father had given Him to do was to be achieved and sealed. But as yet there is a jar, a discord—something blocks the way by which His love would go forth; there is a shadow, chill and ominous; there is the misery of thwarted affection; such words as He would speak now can only be spoken where love is sure of itself and its environment; there must be the security and encouragement of sympathetic attention; there must be the trust which quickens and releases the burden of thought; but in the upper chamber that night there is yet a hateful presence, obstructive and hostile; there is still set dead against the Master's will a will that has recoiled and disowned; cold, dark, and black, it lurks there in the blind corners of the room; unsuspected, undetected by others, it has already set itself to betray its Master with a kiss. Twelve He had chosen, but one of them is a devil; Satan has even now entered into him, and the wounded affection of the betrayed Master is conscious to the very quick of this shadow of hate. Jesus became exceedingly troubled, a shudder of repulsion shook Him, and shook with violence. He would speak to those who were now clean, but not all are clean, and therefore He must make one more effort to overcome or to dislodge this repellent and sinister presence. He has stooped to wash those feet, and yet the traitorous will has never yielded. Now He is forced to more open attack, to more direct appeal. He will disclose the treachery. Surely, then, this stubbornness will relent, this dark plot will be given up. He will confess or abandon it, perhaps be startled into shame and penitence. So He speaks, breaking off short: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, One of you shall betray Me." And it was just then when this hidden hate was being hunted out of its last lair by the Lord, that he whom Jesus loved was drawn into that intimate act by which his trustful familiarity crowned itself. Closer and closer he drew, for he felt the quivering desire of the Master in this His awful hour for that human affection into the heart of which he had withdrawn himself. Close to Him he lay already in the favoured place of one he loved so dearly. His head as he reclined at table lay as usual over against the lap of the Lord. But now, as trouble grew, and as Peter began to assume to use the blessed privilege of his position in order to press home the secret inquiry, he, John, remembers so well that he did not shift at all his position, but still lying just as he was, he threw back his head so that he rested on the very bosom of Jesus, and, looking up into His face so that his lips would all but reach His ear, he passes the whisper which none should catch: "Lord, which is he that betrayeth Thee?" So intimate, so human, so affectionate had been the affection that had knit them one to another, so free, so devoid of all reserve or timidity or fear, and yet, my brethren, it is this

same disciple that Jesus loved, and who lay on His very breast at supper. He also records how afterwards "he was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard a great voice, as of a trumpet, and turned and beheld, and lo! seven golden candlesticks, and in the midst one like unto the Son of Man, clothed with a long garment, and girt with a golden girdle, and his hair was white as wool, and his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet like unto burnished brass, and his voice as the sound of many waters, and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword, and his countenance was as the sun shines in its strength; and when he saw him he fell at his feet as it were dead."

Christ on Earth and in Heaven.—What a contrast! And yet it was his friend whom he saw, unchanged though altered. True, now he fell at his feet as it were dead, still that awful vision never displaced or dimmed the earlier scene. That night in the upper chamber did not suffer eclipse from the shining of that awful countenance. He did not wish now to blot it out as a memory of a mistaken familiarity when he had in his ignorance assumed a position which he now saw to be shocking. He did not feel as a man might feel who had taken undue liberties. All he could now do was to fall on his knees and try to forget that he had ever been guilty of such ignorant deceit. And though the vision had been recorded, though the revelation had been made, though it was he who had sat by his side in all humility, though he had fallen dead at the feet of Him whom he once had treated with such frank simplicity, yet years and years after, recording in the Revelation the vision he had seen, he still cherishes the older memory, still delights to recall in his old age that he had been the man who once lay as a friend in the bosom of Jesus.

My brethren, the highest task of the Christian creed is to retain those two pictures without any sense of collision between them. Evidently to St. John no such collision existed. He had lain on His breast and fallen at His feet, yet neither position seemed inconsistent with the other. And, we, if once we saw the faith with his eyes, would find that the two would somehow coalesce, and yet it is so hard to keep the two balanced. On one side there is the strong impulse, the culture of criticism shrinking back from the Christ of the historical Church, shrinking back from the vision of Him who moves among the golden candlesticks. That is a visionary, mistaken transcendental Christ, so, they complain, that has no real modern significance; it has overlaid the living, breathing, human Christ of the simple Gospel story. That is the Christ whom men now need, whom they can understand, who is like ourselves; with a man's tenderness, emotion, and desire for sympathy, with man's depressions, fears, sorrows, and even ignorance. So criticism busies itself to rediscover the man Jesus, as He talked and walked in Galilee. And then the popular democratic spirit sets, too, in the same direction. Here, too, men ask for the Carpenter's Son, He who worked in a shop, who cared for the poor and healed the body, who lived and died a Man amongst men. Give us Jesus, on whose breast we may lie. That is the demand. Go back to that last night, when He desired to eat the last Passover with His friends. Oh, let us, too, be there. We, too, feel the pathos of that farewell. We can draw close to Him as He takes of the homely meal and the common cup, sharing it with those He loved best, while the storm gathered without. And now on to the betrayal; He never would again taste on earth in their fellowship of the fruit of the grape. That was a moment in which to touch the deepest and the simplest chords that vibrate in the heart of our common humanity. He hallowed for all the common household and daily food, the bond of friendship, all those things which lie at the base of man's being. Close, close to such a teacher we all would press as He tells us in the bitterness of His anguish of the treachery that even then at the last hour would betray Him. But this tender and sympathetic interest is gone if ever we go from this quite homely supper, where we may lie familiarly on His breast, and look up into His face, to some mystic rite, some Eucharist hedged round by the apparatus of ecclesiastical ceremonial, a thing of awe and mystery barred off from the profane by a mediating priesthood and an intervening dogma, hidden away in screened and reserved sanctuaries, and approached even by the initiated through the intricacies of elaborate ritual in attitudes of fear and trembling. What has all this performance to do with the supper in the upper chamber in the evening around the table where John lay upon His bosom? That is a protest we all know and understand, and yet we know also that is only half the trouble, and the other half of it is found in modern days. This awful and even passionate response, far from being inadequate and mediæval and dead, this great spiritual revival of the last fifty years has been due to the especial appeal against which the protest is made, the appeal of the mystic transcendental vision of the risen and ascended Lord who moves amid the golden candlesticks of the Church with presence of awe, solemnity, and dread, whose feet are as burnished brass, whose voice is as the sound of many waters, the majestic and glorified Redeemer, at whose feet they would fall as it were dead. And, moreover, it is just this very Eucharist against which we have rehearsed the complaint here embodied, and realised the full force of this appeal. Men have seen that if Christ be risen and ascended, then that scene in the upper chamber, while yet He stood on earth amid His fellows, could not remain what it was. The final word about it had not yet been said. The Master distinctly anticipated the day not yet come when those His friends should re-enact it as a memorial

of Him before God, and under quite other conditions than those in which they at that moment stood, they would re-enact when He had passed away throughout some long interval until He should come again, should re-enact it under circumstances which would give intelligible meaning to the offer for their real and living food. "His body is meat indeed and His blood is drink indeed."

"In Remembrance of Me."—It was not with what they did then with which He was chiefly concerned, but with what they would do hereafter, do in years to come. "Do this in remembrance of Me." In that hereafter they will do it in all the significance thrown into it by His ascension to the right hand of God; they would do it in the might of the eternal sacrifice and oblation once and for ever offered for the sins of the whole world; they would do it in the sanction of His intercession who has entered into the holy place that is on High; they would do it in the authority of His everlasting priesthood, in the face of His ever-living propitiation, in the power of His commission spirit. And if this be so then the character of the meal must be changed, it must be possessed and transfigured by the Spirit of Him who now reigns on His throne in highest heaven, who is the beginning and the end, and was, and is, and is to come. And in the recognition of this the simple upper chamber must become a sanctuary, the common table must become an altar, and the homely act must become a sacrifice, and the mere memorial of a long past event become the real presence of the living Lord. It is to this recognition that hearts have turned in such thousands in our day, it is by this that our faith lives with fresh ardour, it is this which even in those bodies of Christians who more especially represent English Protestantism is restoring the rich language of the Eucharistal sacrifice to the priesthood of the ascended Lord. It is this which we ourselves demand with wonder, and mystery and awe should once again breathe from our beautified sanctuaries, and fill their vaults with the rapture of music. That it is that fills our churches with those who have thrown aside that awful cold reserve out of which all worship seemed to have vanished, and who now draw near in communion, bowing low in adoration under the thrill of the might entry of Him who moves around the golden candlesticks, majestical and mighty, at whose feet they would fall as it were dead.

A Mode of Reconciliation.—So stand the opposing camps—both are strong, and both are defiant, and neither can yield a jot. How are they ever to understand one another, still more to come together? So we might think, so we might despair, and yet let both sides hold fast to themselves, but sharp as the antithesis may be, there is a reconciliation that does underlie it, and St. John is the pledge for the possibility of its reality, though they may be dazed and blinded, though to us the two aspects may appear to be in hopeless hostility, he finds in them nothing antagonistic to him. Both meet in one undivided person; to him both convey a single impression, the impression of that one Lord and Master, who is wholly and utterly the same to him whether he lay on His bosom or fell at His feet, as it were, dead. St. John is the pledge to us of a deeper verity than we perhaps can master, he is our pledge and he asks us to wait on and pray that we may be led at last to see these two pictures mingle, as they did to him, into one figure, whose name under either aspect was the Word of God. And in order that we may arrive at that reconciliation we must on either side restrain ourselves with some effort. If, for instance, we are of those whose tendency inclines towards the simplicity of that most gracious Man, whose sweet human presence, as it speaks to us out of the Gospel narrative, forces itself nearer and nearer to the light, and enables us to touch as it were the hem of His garment, and lean our head upon His breast; then, while yielding to the sway which that personal fascination lays rightly upon us, let us, nevertheless, compel ourselves to recall that all this, however beautiful and real, however good as a road by which to approach Him, could never by itself have made Him the living Heart of religion, unless it had been lifted out of that dead past, and constituted a present and eternal fact as real to us to-day as it was 1,800 years ago, by the vivifying efficacy of the Resurrection and Ascension. Without that it might be beautiful, but it could never be made religious. And if, on the other hand, we are of those whose whole being has fastened on the mystery of the redemptive sacrifice, and whose every instinct bids them take the shoes from off their feet as they touch the precincts of His sanctuary, where amid such glories as our poor skill may provide, He moves down who dwelleth upon the Cherubims, He who comes with the angel and archangel and all the Company of heaven that we, too, here may mingle our weak voices with theirs giving praise and honour and glory to Him that sitteth on the Throne. If such be we, if we have tasted of that blessing, then in the very midst of our thanksgiving for so deep a privilege, let us still force ourselves to remember the actual human reality of that flesh and blood which comes to us with the great mystery; let us fasten on the plain statements of the simple Gospel story, bring them to mind, and never attempt to strip them of their pathos and downright directness of meaning. Christ was a man who ate and drank and slept and was tired; who was content to be shut up by narrow local historical limitations. Let men love Him as they would love a friend who suffered John to lie without alarm in His love, and look up in His face and whisper in His ears. Let us remember that He is our Friend. And, moreover, we have to meet this double-sided character of our

Redeemer, not only by public tolerance for our Christian neighbours, but in our own devotional life.

A Necessity of Christian Devotion.—No Christian devotion can be true that does not set itself seriously to retain both aspects, and to keep both in balance, correcting the familiarity of friendship by the vision of Him who moveth amid the golden candlesticks, correcting the rapture of the vision by the little recognition of that human friend in whose breast John lay. How far apart the two lines of devotion often appear; how deep a gulf seems to open between us; we see the Christ of the *Dies Irae*, the Jesus brought before us in the passion music that we know so well in St. Paul's, between the Christ of the Latin mediævalism and the Christ of the great German Luther. Is it indeed, we may say, the same Lord whom we trust:

> "Oh what fears man's bosom rendeth
> When from heaven the Judge descendeth
> On whose sentence all dependeth.
> Low I kneel with heart submission
> See like ashes my contrition.
> Help me in my last condition,
> Spare, O God, in mercy spare us."

And then, when we speak in another voice, so soft and so confiding, bidding sinners come. Come where? To Jesu's bosom—

> "Seek salvation freely offered."

Seek it where? In Jesu's bosom. Live and die all to Him. Rest! Rest where? "In Jesu's bosom." There is the variance again, and yet the Christian heart understands both, it passes, if it be true to itself, from one to another, without a jar. Our faith may yield in the difficulty of reconciliation, and therefore it must be always learning more and more of the secret bond that makes both one. This discipline, this growth, lies in its steady passage between the two lines of advance, learning at one moment what it means to fall at His feet as one dead, and at another, to lie without fear in His bosom.

Shall we try to preserve, by earnestness in our devotion and in our private prayers, the severity and awe which belong to the Judge, with affectionate familiarity with the Lord, to retain it with the warmth and glow of a child's fearless tenderness as we fall under the flame of those eyes which search us through and through with terrible precision? It can be done. St. John is our pledge, and all the highest and best of Christian saintliness is a witness to it. There is no gulf here, each aspect of Jesus enriches and intensifies the other. If we will but be faithful to the Christian life, we shall find, as St. John found, that the sight of that awful vision which he saw at Patmos only increased the emotion with which he recalled the memory of how Jesus had loved him and had folded him to His breast. We shall be able, with all the more heart, to enter into the devotional tones which break out with the fervour of fellowship. It is the Judge Himself who is our Lover. It is the terror of the Judge Himself which forces us to fly to that refuge where we shall be secure. The Judge Himself, who drives us from Him as a Judge, calls us to Him from the very terror that He Himself has created, bidding us say of Himself,

> Jesu, lover of my soul,
> Let me to Thy bosom fly.
> Other refuge have I none,
> Hangs my helpless soul on Thee.

The Dean of Bangor has renewed the custom—which has been in abeyance for some time—of summoning all the non-residentiary Canons to all the meetings of the Chapter.

The Bishop of Chester has appointed the Rev. Andrew E. P. Gray, rector of Wallasey, to be a member of the Council of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, in the room of Canon Moberly, now Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology at Oxford.

The Bishop of Winchester, who is now residing at Farnham Castle, preached on Sunday to the inmates of the workhouse from Eph. ii. 18. This, says the *Standard*, is believed to be the first occasion on which a prelate of the see of St. Swithin has taken part in divine service at such an institution. The Bishop celebrated his sixty-seventh birthday on Monday.

The Dean and Chapter of Bangor Cathedral have unanimously appointed Mr. T. Westlake Morgan, organist of St. David's Church, Merthyr Tydfil, organist and choirmaster of Bangor Cathedral, in succession to Dr. Roland Rogers. Out of 100 applicants six were selected, five of whom were examined by Dr. Creser, organist of the Chapel Royal, St. James's, at Chester Cathedral.

The Rev. J. H. Timins has recently completed his jubilee as vicar of West Malling, Kent, and at a public meeting of the parishioners he was presented with an illuminated address. By the vicar's request the testimonial took the form of presents to the church. These were a pair of seven-light altar candle standards with inscriptions, a carved oak credence-table, and a brass double pulpit candle standard. On Whit Sunday a carved oak lectern, the gift of a parishioner, was also placed in the church, the carving being the voluntary work of the local class held under the Kent County Council technical education scheme.

The Duke of York, K.G., the Duke of Connaught, K.G., Princess Christian, the Prince and Princess Henry of Battenberg, the Duke of Cambridge, K.G., the Duke of Fife, K.G., Mrs. Temple, Miss Octavia Hill, the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Lyon Playfair, M.P., Sir James Crichton Browne, Dr. Magregor, Moderator of the Established Church of Scotland; Dr. Blaikie, Moderator of the Free Church of Scotland; Dr. Black, Moderator of the United Presbyterian Church; Dr. Gibson, Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in England; Dr. Stephenson, President of the Wesleyan Conference; Principal Vaughan Price, Secretary of the Congregational Union; Principal Fairbairn, and Dr. Dallinger, have written expressing their approval of the aims of the Church of England Burial, Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, and regretting their inability to be present at the Annual Meeting next week.

Funeral Reform Association.

14th ANNIVERSARY.

OBJECT.—*To unite all, wherever English is spoken, in the effort to re-establish the Church's "earth to earth" mode of burial, with Christian, sanitary, and economical adjuncts.*

CONFERENCE of Members of the Council and Committees, and Local Hon. Secretaries, on Monday, June 20th, at 3.30 p.m., at the Church House, the ARCHDEACON OF LONDON in the chair.

DRAWING-ROOM MEETING, on Tuesday, June 21st, at 4.30 p.m., by permission of Lady Frederick Cavendish, at 21, Carlton House Terrace.

ANNUAL MEETING, on Thursday, June 23rd, at 3.30 p.m., at the Church House, the LORD BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD in the chair.

ANNUAL SERMON, on Sunday, June 26th, at 3.30 p.m., at St. Paul's Church, Onslow Square. Preacher, the VENERABLE ARCHDEACON OF LONDON.

REV. F. LAWRENCE, Westow, York,
Hon. Sec.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 1892.

THE TRINITY ORDINATION.

THE change that has come over the Church of England during this generation is most plainly reflected in the character of the young clergy. Fifty years ago, we suppose, men took orders for various reasons; men now appear to seek ordination for only one—a real serious desire to do the work. The forty or so men, nearly all young, who were ordained by the Bishop of London last Sunday, appeared to have only one motive, and certainly showed by their exercises and meditations that they were bringing to their work complete sincerity and a large share of liberality and common sense. It was impossible to move among them without seeing how keen an interest they took in the various problems connected with their work, social and industrial, even more than theological, and how thoroughly in touch most of them were with everyday life, and especially how loyal they were to the principles and government of the Church, and the admiration they showed for their most excellent bishop. The appreciation felt for the magnificent qualities and sterling worth of the Bishop of London, as well as for the deep mark he has left upon his age, intensified the general regret that he was prevented from getting a little below the surface in his personal interviews; there was universal disappointment that the arduous labours of the bishop prevented him from according to his candidates anything more than a brief criticism of the style of their sermons. One thing was obvious from the preparation of the candidates: the younger men have a truer insight into the details of their profession than their elders. It is a mistake to advise young parsons to separate themselves as much as possible from the lives of their parishioners—a clergyman ought not to live a life apart. The spiritual life is everything, truly, but it is incompatible with inexperience of the pleasures as well as the pains of ordinary human existence. A man cannot teach about what he does not understand, and his sympathies must be narrowed, and his sense of proportion obscured, if he keeps entirely on a different plane. Whole aspects of life are closed to the man who regards those not of his profession as "only laymen." The moral for the clergy ought to be "as using the world, and not abusing it"—disuse is, in a certain sense, abuse.

The want of proportion involved in this advice was curiously exemplified in the remark that lawn-tennis was working as much evil as any other vice in modern society. Here the sound truth intended to be conveyed by the speaker was obscured and weighted by the disproportionate language in which it was expressed. The mind revolts at the suggestion that the comparatively limited pastime of lawn tennis is on a level with the social evil, the drink curse, the blight of pauperism, and the other awful ills at present afflicting humanity. We agree entirely with the speaker in what he wished to impress upon his hearers; we regret the lack of proportion his words involved; the perspective of morals is entirely thrown out by it, and this is a fault which ought to be particularly avoided by the clergy. The moralist's position is hopelessly weakened if he is unable to discriminate between one situation and another—and lets us know it.

There was also a certain want of practical advice to candidates; we will only touch on one point where it was needed. The pay and position of the clergy are not sufficient to attract men of fine physique, and the candidates for ordination, are not, as a rule, of any particular presence. It is most unfortunate, therefore that many young clergymen now adopt a style of dress and behaviour by no means personally becoming, and yet so conspicuous as to attract a good deal of notice. The sable habit is, we suppose, prescribed by high antiquity, but the peculiar features of skirts, and collars, and cloaks, and especially of head-gear, we take it, are of no higher authority than the tailors', and they are running riot. It would be as well for the clergy to remember that "the outward appearance satisfieth not" in more senses than one, and that a man will probably not lose much either in this world or the next, if he is becomingly dressed.

There is even a rubric about being "decently habited," and that is not limited to the converse of

indecently. We cannot think that a little advice in matters of this sort would be inappropriate, even to candidates for ordination.

THE THREEFOLD NATURE OF MAN.

(*Communicated.*)

THE two Greek words which are usually rendered into English by "life" and "soul" respectively are not exactly parallel with the words by which we translate them. Ζωή is life in the absolute sense of a condition; that which men, animals, and plants possess; and is the antithesis of death, or has death for its negative. Ψυχή is never life, as the mere state of living; it is the particular life of the individual, and it includes all that is alive in him, both the physical life that man has in common with the lower animals, and the mental life which he has in a superior degree, if not of a higher kind. It means, therefore, supposing that it can be taken absolutely, mental life. It expresses, accordingly, more than we generally mean by *life*, and less than we generally mean by *soul*. In our translations of the New Testament, especially in the last, a discrimination very nearly perfect has been used in rendering ψυχή by that one of those two words which conveys most correctly that variety of the meaning in the original which can generally be expressed in English only by one of them. "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," could not be "my life, etc." with any propriety; and where Epaphroditus is mentioned as "not regarding his life," to say "not regarding his soul" would convey an entirely erroneous meaning. Yet it is the same word in both places in the original.

"Death" is the evident negative of "life," but there is no real or proper negative to the living mental faculty. This does not hinder it from having an antithesis or opposite, and it has more than one. "Body" is its opposite in one relation, and "spirit" is its opposite in another relation. The practical difficulty in rendering ψυχή always by *soul* is that the common imagination is disposed to confound *soul* and *spirit*, to look on them as identical, or as synonymous. The mere statement of this is enough to make the error perceptible, and the error is still more evident when we come to meet the adjective derived from ψυχή. We are without any adjective in English parallel to, or, at all a literal translation of ψυχικός. In determining how it ought to be rendered, or what significance should be given to the word which we employ, for want of a direct one, for it, more than one consideration, has to be observed. We have to inform ourselves of its application in writings older than the Epistle of St. Paul in which it is to be found; we have to examine its etymology; and we are not to overlook that, in using the word, St. Paul was treating of a subject never treated of in classical works, and that he had to create a new nomenclature for new ideas.

Ψυχικός occurs four times in the New Testament; its use in 1 Cor. xv. 44 and 46, being counted for once as only a repetition. All investigation of its meaning in that place, and in the 2nd chapter verse 14 of the same Epistle, covers the passages in James iii. 15, and in Jude, verse 19. It may be assumed that its meaning in the two places of the Epistle to the Corinthians is the same; what it qualifies, and not its own significance, differing in those two places. Naturally, as an adjective, it should mean pertaining to ψυχή; and we find that in authors before St. Paul, it is used in opposition to σωματικός. In both instances St. Paul uses it in opposition to πνευματικός, but because he so employs it is no reason for that being the only antithesis, for he uses πνευματικός as an opposite to σαρκικός (carnal), a few verses beyond 1 Cor. ii, 14; and if one of these words can properly have two opposites, so can the other. That is, that the carnal, natural (ψυχικός), and spiritual, are three qualities belonging to the human constitution, not contrary, essentially, to each other, but differing, and mutually antithetic in certain of their relations. It is probably needless to do more than call attention to what is now to a great extent recognised, that this view of the threefold constitution of man pervades St. Paul's writings, nay, is characteristic of him. One quotation only is it useful to make; 1 Thess. v. 23, "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Here it is evident that our translators use the right word. If they had used life, it would have been more excusably inferable than it can be now, that that *soul* which is spoken of throughout both the Old and New Testament is the same as man's immortal spirit. This view of man as a Trinity, though to be found as far back as in the Mosaic account of the Creation, when God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, is a view of which there s in Grecian literature and in the Greek language no expression; and accordingly St. Paul was under the necessity of taking those terms to express his meanings which in strict definition came nearest to his meanings; and by imparting to them, as respecting their new relations, fuller meaning than they had had before, to invent or discover for his new philosophy, a new and ample technical nomenclature. An ordinary educated man of the period when the Epistles were written, we need not suppose a Platonist or a follower of any particular school would have understood what was meant if the human constitution were described as possessed of bodily, vital, and mental faculties. He might not have accepted that description, and might have preferred some more subtle, perhaps more poetical doctrine; but he would have understood it, and it would not have been novel to him. But to be told that merely vital functions are not anything more than the mode of connection between the body and the mind which is necessary to produce identity of person; and that above the body and the mind, and their connecting vitality, there is in man a spirit which gives him a community of nature—how close is not defined, but still a community, with the Divine; this is what would have been new, and at first, perhaps, is incomprehensible; and this is what St. Paul had to impress on his pupils of the Churches of Greece and Ionia. Men and animals have living bodies, and minds dwelling in and influenced by those bodies and influencing them. A Greek of the first century might have supposed, as many men do at this time, more enlightened though they have opportunity to be, that the difference between men and animals is only that the extra corporeal functions of men are the most powerful and the most ample St. Paul told such that men have a third function, πνεῦμα, which animals have not.

This would not, however, occupy all the metaphysical ground requiring to be covered. The Greeks recognised the quality of νοῦς, *mind* or perception, an abstract and not a personal quality, as a function of man, and this νοῦς it is, and not ψυχή, that would have

been attributed to the lower animals. As ζωή is a quality common to all, and not a personal quality, but life in the abstract, that which is personal, and possesses the life, being the body (σῶμα); so νοῦς is the abstract mental quality which is possessed by, or incorporated with, the ψυχή, this latter being not life merely as such, but *a man's life* or *soul.* This ψυχή is also that faculty to which those of the ancients who believed in immortality attributed immortality. What was new in the Christian doctrine of resurrection was not life after death, but the life after death of an hitherto unknown πνεῦμα, which, both in this existence and in the other, is the Godlike in man. St. Paul's philosophy does not take from, but adds to and completes the best preceding philosophy. It says to it, "What is immortal, and more than immortal, divine in man, is not the life or soul, but the spirit, which searcheth even the profound things of God."

Accordingly, as ζωή is that by which the body communicates with the spirit as well as with the mind, and is adopted, if the term be admissible, by the spirit in the life eternal, so νοῦς, the intellect absolute, is the connection between ψυχή and πνεῦμα a spirit. Therefore, as the spiritual disposition is developed in the individual, the νοῦς becomes more and more spiritual; in other words, it is the faculty of man which is susceptible of experiencing spiritual progress or growth. This is plainly intimated by St. Paul, where immediately after his statement of the spirit's discerning power in the words, "we have the mind (νοῦν) of Christ," he shows that this human faculty of the Son of God, which we may assume that He held in His capacity as a man, is not diverse from, but more spiritual than, the ordinary human mind or understanding.

As observed above, the spirit is an opposite to the life or soul, and is also an opposite to the body, or rather to the flesh. But it is not an opposite to these in the same mode. It is the moral opposite to the flesh; it is the intellectual opposite to the life or soul; it is the ontological opposite, and no more, to both. These antithetic relations extend, it is reasonable to assume, to the adjectives derived from these words in the same manner as they apply to the words substantive. It is not possible that so correct a writer as St. Paul should have employed the derivatives of these words in any way that would justify applications of the derivatives to ideas altogether foreign to those which belong to the radical words, unless the derivatives had already acquired, by use in literature, secondary meanings, nothing of which perversion is there in the cases before us. Under this consideration it is plain that the rendering of ψυχικός by *natural*, or by *sensual*, is open to very serious objection. The use of that translation, *natural*, in our older version (repeated in the Revised) is in high probability taken from Luther. The Vulgate employs, in the four places, *animalis;* Luther uses *natürlich* in translating Paul, *menschlich* in James, and *fleischlich* in Jude. Now there is no German word answering to the Latin *animalis*, which comes from *anima* (as near a Latin word for ψυχή as could be imagined); and *natürlich* does not accordingly depart from the Greek so far as *natural* in English does, because we might have adopted the Latin *animal*, having it as an almost direct translation of ψυχικός. The French New Testament has *animal* in 1st Cor.; *sensuelle* in James and Jude. It is, however, nearly as far from the intention of the original to render the word into English by *animal* as by *natural.* Metaphysical and theological terms have suffered a very great depreciation by passing through the Latin language, possibly because it was through the unclassical Latin of the Middle Ages that they passed. *Animal* does not convey to us anything of that which belongs to the ψυχή, nor does *natural;* yet to translate ψυχικός by a term that is near its meaning, that is *living mental*, is exceedingly clumsy, and does not convey anything at all near to the fulness of the Greek word. *Intellectual* might do, but ψυχή contains an idea of something vivid, while intellect suggests calmness and not action; not, unless so qualified, imaginative, creative intellect. Besides, it is more associable with νοῦς than with ψυχή. In 1st Cor. ii. 14, to read "the imaginative man receives not the things of God's Spirit," might be held to convey what St. Paul intends, but that word would not express the meaning in xv. 44. While the expression is applicable in defining the difference between the imaginative and the spiritual character, it is my opinion that St. Paul does not intend to speak of characters. The article ὁ is omitted in ii. 14, and it has been proposed to translate it "a natural man" for that reason. If ψυχή is a personal attribute like the body, and if the adjective is a strict derivative, and if this attribute is not one like imagination, a thing that some men possess more, some less, some hardly at all, then St. Paul must mean that the part of man's constitution which receives the things of God's Spirit is not the part which is ψυχικοί, but that he who is really spiritual (and here he speaks of a character) judges concerning everything, both of this state of being and of the other. For, proceeding to xv. 44 and 46, it is evident that not only the man, the person himself, is ψυχικός, but his body is so. We are helped to this apprehension of the author's meaning in the second chapter by the opposition which he goes on immediately (3, *et seq.*) to speak of between the spiritual and carnal dispositions; an opposition evidently moral, while that between the spiritual and "natural" dispositions, if we suppose him to draw the contrast, is not a moral, but an intellectual opposition. On every ground *natural* is a translation to be objected to. The idea that it includes cannot but be referred to *nature*, so often spoken of by the same author as the opposite state to that of grace, as in Eph. ii. 3, "Ye were by nature (*i.e.*, as born) children of wrath." This is a moral opposite to the state of grace, and ψυχικός contains no moral implication whatever.

So far as concerning the first use of the word. In the 15th chapter of the same Epistle it is not the "natural" man, but the "rational" body of man that is spoken of. And it is evident that this word suggests meanings which are not only not the same as those intended by the author, but are actually contrary to them. *Natural* presents to us the idea of *material*, and ψυχή is as immaterial, as extra-corporeal, as πνεῦμα. It is not to be questioned that the common idea of the resurrection body is of one which is to be "spiritual," which is right, because it is the only word that the divinely-inspired writer uses. But it is not the case that "spiritual" involves being not material. For if the spiritual body, because it is spiritual, is non-material, then the "natural" body, "natural" being of or belonging to the soul or life, must be non-material too. Therefore the resurrection body is a body not the same as, but like the present body, and like in being material if like at all; and over it the spirit will be the predominating and efficacious influence, as the soul or intellectual life is the ruling influence over the present body. This is

what the text xv. 44, taken by itself, conveys; and the analogy by which St. Paul leads up to this, the wheat in the ear being as material as the seed-corn, points to the truth, which, though he does not derive it from the analogy, he illustrates with it, and that most closely and unmistakably. "It is sown an animal body; it is raised a spiritual body; there is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body." St. Paul insists, in words which could not be exceeded in authority, and which could not be exceeded in definiteness, that the Body, which rose on the first Easter morn, is the first example of what every body of men in the resurrection shall be. One of the special events of the few weeks of our Saviour's post-resurrection life was a direct proof, given with intention, to the only doubter amongst His followers, that His body was material.

All the objections to the rendering of ψυχικός by *natural* are as strong, if not stronger, against *sensual*. In James iii. 15 where what is characterised as *wisdom*, this is almost an incongruity, as it is much more proper to describe a mental disposition or power by that which belongs to the mind, and not by a reference to the senses, which are bodily. In Jude, verse 19, the incongruity does not appear so great; there, however, ψυχικός should be translated as it ought to be elsewhere.

How then ought that word to be done into English? We have no direct equivalent but *animal*, which is not applicable, as it does not convey the real meaning; and failing any other, there is nothing satisfactory except to adopt the word into English, viz., *psychical*.

IN MEMORIAM.—HENRY LINDSAY.

HENRY LINDSAY was the son of the Rev. H. Lindsay, vicar of Croydon, and on his mother's side was connected with Captain Marryat, the well-known novelist. He was at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A. degree in 1846, and in the same year was ordained to the curacy of Sibbertoft, in the diocese of Peterborough. In 1850 he was appointed vicar of Ide Hill, in Kent, and in 1863 rector of Kettering. Bishop Magee conferred upon him an honorary canonry in 1870, and appointed him Rural Dean of Weldon II. in 1881.

When he came to Kettering the population of the parish was under 6,000, when he died it was 20,000; but rapidly as the population increased Church work under the rector kept pace with it; four new schools were established, making eight schools now in connection with the church; a church institute, church guilds, and many classes and clubs were formed; St. Andrew's Church was built in 1871, the church-room in 1873, and, by the munificence of an anonymous donor, the temporary iron church of St. Mary, soon we hope to be replaced by a permanent structure, was added in 1889. For many years the rector was anxious to see the noble parish church restored, but he was as patient in waiting as he was zealous in action, and it was not till 1889 that he saw an opportunity of beginning this great work, the completion of which he did not live to see.

But it was above all as a parish priest among the sick and sorrowful that the rector of Kettering was at his greatest. In his parish day after day, early and late, wherever there was sickness, no matter how infectious, wherever there was sorrow, in the home of Churchman and Nonconformist alike, he was to be found. In his parish, following the steps of the Divine Master, he went about doing good, and at all times in his own house he was ready to attend to the wants of his parishioners, and was most truly their servant for Jesus' sake. He was an impressive preacher; few men were more in request at the reopening of churches after restoration, or at harvest festivals. He was a delightful companion; but it was not often that the rector was too be seen outside of his parish. He had in the earlier days of his ministry to encounter that measure of opposition which earnest men must encounter; but he bore it with admirable patience. For twenty-nine years he worked patiently, unsparingly, lovingly, and gained the esteem of all, and when he entered into rest left behind him the character of one who pleased not himself.

H. H.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE SERMON BIBLE." Vol. IX. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

THE volume now before us covers the seventh and following chapters of the Acts, and the whole of the Epistle to the Romans, and of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians.

We are rather surprised at the list of books referred to in the introduction, not for those named, but for those omitted. Dean Stanley's "Commentary on the Corinthians" is not mentioned, while Bishop Ellicot's is; yet the former is as much better for the preacher as the latter is for the student. Again, Professor Jowett's essays in his "Commentary on the Romans" are full of ideas which a preacher may work out himself for an educated congregation, but that again is not referred to.

Still we have no wish to complain; the analyses of such sermons as we have tested are very well done, and we do not doubt that this volune will prove as useful as its predecessors.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION *VERSUS* AIONIAL PURGATORY.

SIR,—I believe that "eternal" and "utter," or "utterly," when accompanying "the Scriptural words *destruction* and *to perish*," do "mean endless or irreversible." But I hope when "J. B." gets home, he will notice what I urged on May 21st about the meaning which the words *destruction* and *perishing* bore for those who wrote, and who first read the New Testament, even without the word *eternal*.

I suppose I may take his statement that certain "eminent Christian writers in the early centuries evidently did not believe that the sin against the Holy Ghost would never be forgiven," as his answer to my question of May 21st, as to whether he holds that those who commit that sin will ever be forgiven, or will be united to Christ for endless life and immortality, without being forgiven. If so, he flatly contradicts the words of Christ, in Mark iii. 29, according to both A.V.

and R. V." But then he says "our translators were evidently not infallible men." Of course not; but then I think he ought to have given a more accurate translation of our Lord's words than "hath never forgiveness." I suspect he would say they mean "hath not forgiveness for the *æon*," or "the age." Still I gather from his words that "J. B." holds that the sinners against the Holy Ghost *will* be forgiven *sometime*, and "will not be united to Christ for endless life and immortality without being forgiven." I have heard some, when pressed on this point, say they will not need or get forgiveness, having been destroyed body and soul in hell for an æon, or as "J. B." would say, for some "millions of æons of suffering"; but I am glad to find that "J. B." does not share *that* opinion. He holds that "the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall be forgiven unto men." But our Lord, in Luke xii. 10 and Matt. xii. 31, says it "shall NOT be forgiven unto men"; and here there is no question about translation. Our Lord simply and directly negatives "J. B.'s" proposition, and "J. B." flatly (of course with all reverence, and not meaning it at all) contradicts our Lord. This ought to settle the whole question against him. No Universalist can ever get out of this dilemma. He must either save the sinners against the Holy Ghost without their being forgiven, which is absurd and monstrous, and which "J. B." repudiates; or he must contradict our Lord by saying that that sin "*shall* be forgiven them," whereas our Lord says it "shall *not*."

"J. B." said, May 28th, that he understands me as "able to contemplate with serenity, as a final result of the Scheme of Redemption, the prospect that 'some will be destroyed, body and soul in hell, in an everlasting destruction, while others, etc.'" He now says that he "does not charge me with stating that the eternal destruction of the finally impenitent is a result of the Scheme of Redemption, and his words do not bear such a meaning." I am glad to find he did not intend such a meaning, but I appeal to my fellow-readers of his letter in protesting that his words expressed it clearly enough.

"J. B." says, "As far as he can understand the ideas of me and others of my school of thought, cremation on the largest conceivable scale is, and will be, constantly annihilating or destroying the greater part of what God has created, spirit as well as matter." Perhaps he will be glad to know that he misunderstands our ideas. I would strike out of that sentence the following expressions:—(1) "The largest conceivable scale" (for we can conceive the scale as so much larger than it will be, as to include all who are saved by grace from the cremation in question); (2) the word "is" after "scale" (for we hold that no such cremation is going on at present, or will begin till after the final judgment); (3) the word "constantly" (for we do not think the cremation will go on even for "J. B.'s" "millions of ages of suffering"); and (4) "the greater part" (for we never make ourselves judges of the proportion the saved will bear to "them that perish"). Leaving out these four expressions and bearing in mind that, as I have repeatedly given "J. B." to understand, we are quite content to admit that our Lord's repeated mention of what "J. B." (rather irreverently as it seems to me) speaks of as "cremation" may be taken figuratively, if only truthfully, and not as an exaggeration, "J. B.'s" notion of our "ideas" is correct enough, and might be easily gathered from the New Testament Scriptures, from which we gather the ideas themselves. Not to speak of their scripturalness, I think them vastly more reasonable and even more just and more merciful than "J. B.'s" ideas of that "in the case of a large proportion" of mankind and, I suppose, of devil-kind, too, "incalculable ages of acute disciplinary suffering"—"millions of ages of suffering"—will "intervene" between them in their present state and that union with Christ for a joyful immortality which "J. B." and other elect people have reached in a few years, if not a few days, from their birth, those days and years being more or less full of joy in God and of all the blessings of this life. As I said in my last, I believe there is no man or devil but would protest against the cruelty and injustice of being subjected to such a doom instead of the doom of death perishing utterly body and soul in hell, that was threatened to *men* at any rate. Indeed, when we come to think of what "J. B." considers in store for the non-elect—at a moderate estimate, two or three thousand millions of years spent in what our Lord calls a lake or a furnace of fire—before they attain to saving union with Christ, we cannot help thinking there is not much to choose between "J. B.'s" ideas and those held by endless torment men. The endless blessedness to be reached after all is put quite too far off (while the interval is so unspeakably awful and so tremendously protracted) to have any conceivable effect in the way of hope or desire. The interval would seem an eternity (in the ordinary sense of the word) to any man or devil who had to go through it. Such would certainly say, with one consent, that the game was not worth the candle, and that they had been infamously cheated by being entered against their will and without their consent on such a race for such a prize.

"J. B." wishes me to exchange conceptions with him as to the "condition and occupation of the redeemed in a future life." Profitless as that delightful task would be, I would set about it if only to please "J. B.," were it not that it would quite distract my attention, as well as his and our readers', from the subject we are discussing. He seems to think that the non-elect are to be kept in "acute disciplinary sufferings" for "incalculable ages" for "millions of ages of suffering," very much for the purpose of affording employment to the elect, who it seems are, according to "J. B.," to conduct the discipline and to *improve* the suffering. But I would ask him does he suppose this "disciplinary suffering" of the non-elect to go on for ever (in the ordinary sense of "for ever")? Is there never to come a time when evil shall be banished from, or destroyed out of, God's universe, and God shall be all in all?" I imagine "J. B." hopes with me that such a time will come and will last for ever (in the ordinary sense) when it does come. Well then, his occupation, so far as he has disclosed what he conceives it will be, will then be gone; and he must start afresh on some new occupation which, for all he knows, may be such as I conceive mine will be, and that or some other new occupation will be endless, while his occupation in the disciplining and saving of the non-elect will only be temporary.

I confess I do not understand "J. B." about his aspirations after *free agency*. Nor do I see their connection with the subject in hand, unless it be that the millions of ages of acute disciplinary sufferings are, in the case of the non-elect at any rate, necessary for constituting those free agents who are now "mere puppets" in their absolute dependence on God. If I am right so far, I would like to know if that change has or has not taken place with "J. B." and other

elect people; and if it is still to be effected with him and them, how long, "J. B." supposes, the process will last, and what he supposes the process will be. I hope it will not be by means of "aionial purgatory" of whatever length; and yet some things that "J. B." has written look as if he thought so.

VINDEX.

June 12th, 1892.

SIR,—Although I agree on the whole with your correspondent "J. B." in his teaching about the eternal purposes of God's goodness and mercy ultimately extending over all his works, I must ask permission to point out a misapplication of the words of Scripture, where he says:—"There is a passage indicating that some of the elect will be 'saved so as by fire.'" There is no such passage. The allusion is to 1 Corinthians iii. 15, and the correct translation is "through fire," as out of a burning house. See the Revised Version.

The meaning of the entire passage is that if any man honestly bases his life and life's work on Christ, he shall not come into condemnation; but every man's work shall be tested in a way which for thoroughness can only be compared to fire testing what is and what is not fireproof. He whose work endures the test shall receive a reward. He whose work is destroyed shall be saved, because he built on Christ's foundation; but he shall suffer the loss of his reward. The case is that of a servant who has received a talent to be used for his master and loses it, not from wickedness or sloth, but from some less blameworthy cause, as want of vigilance or errors of judgment. I believe there are many passages of Scripture which suggest hope of ultimate salvation for those who are condemned when they stand before the judgment-seat of Christ to give an account of what they have done in the body, and receive for the same, whether good or bad (2 Corinthians v. 10). I believe the fire of God's anger will be the means of purifying these, but the passage quoted above from 1 Corinthians does not bear on this question.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

June 13th, 1892.

PREBENDARY BASSETT'S SERMON.

SIR,—In Mr. Murphy's excellent comment on this sermon there is a remark which surprises me, as coming from one who has so clear a comprehension of the essence and office of divine revelation. Speaking of the insertion of the account given of the creation of the sun, moon and stars, in Gen. i., between the creation of the vegetable kingdom and the creation of animals, he adds that "it is better to let this question stand over as an unsolved and probably insoluble difficulty." It seems to me, on the contrary, that not only is this location of the creation of the heavenly bodies easy of explanation, but that it is also an invaluable indication of the principle on which the inspired cosmogony is constructed.

Of course, so long as the mind is possessed by the notion that the cosmogony is intended to be in any sense a setting-forth of the historical order in which the different parts of the system came into existence—in other words, a popular scientific representation of actual facts—the placing of the origin of the heavenly bodies where it stands is beyond explanation. The attempts of the reconciling school of interpreters to account for it are mere subterfuges. Well then, let us get rid of the historical notion as unworkable, and see what can be substituted for it. The writer, an inspired seer and poet in one, looking out on the glorious universe, sees it in his imagination gradually emerging step by step out of the original chaos till it reaches completion in the cosmos, and is charged to describe the process as one of divine workmanship, whereby an abode is built up and furnished for the race which God has made for Himself in His own likeness. He has, then, before his mind an ideal or poetical order, which by the nature of the case falls into this form: First, the breaking forth of light on the darkness of chaos, through which the mighty evolution becomes visible to the seer's eye. Then the arrangement of the material to form a dwelling-place, dry land for its floor, surrounded by the separated waters, the firmament for its roof, with a provision of waters above for future use. The fabric thus fashioned, ample but bare, needs furniture and adornment, hence the next step is the clothing of the soil with all the varied wealth and beauty of vegetation, forest and fruit-tree, flower and herb, in the rich profusion of the Eastern landscape. This done, it still has to be peopled with animal life, and the several elements, water, air, and dry land, are made to swarm with their appropriate inhabitants. The abode is now ready, and the placing of man within it, to be its occupier and lord, completes the series of creative acts.

Such, I conceive, is the ideal scheme of creation present to the seer's thought, and used by him under divine inspiration as a vehicle for declaring the glorious purpose and operation of God, and man's peculiar relation to Him. Now if, as is only natural, a special mention is to be made of the bright orbs of the sky, as part of the furniture provided by God for man's home, where would that mention most fitly come? Not at the beginning, for the first idea is simply of light, to render the creative process visible. Neither during the sorting out of land and water, and the covering of the earth with vegetation, for in these processes the heavenly orbs are not concerned. But the moment the vegetable kingdom has come into existence, these orbs are necessary, for they rule the day and the night and the revolving seasons of seed-time, growth, and harvest, on which the vegetable kingdom is dependent. Here then, in the order of thought, is the place for introducing the bright rulers of the day and night; and here we find them in the cosmogony—a strong corroboration of the theory that the cosmogony is ideal, and not historical or scientific.

Let me add that another corroboration is afforded by the order in which animal life is introduced. The seer's classification has nothing to do with science; organisation, physiology, evolution, are altogether foreign to it. He groups his tribes by their respective habitats; one group belongs to the waters, another to the air, the third and last to the dry land. These are his three zoological classes; in what order shall he introduce them? On the ideal theory, which postulates a regular ascent from chaos to man, the crown of the cosmos, the class farthest removed from man ought to be introduced earliest, and the class nearest to him latest. This is exactly what we find. The waters are no home for man, its inhabitants are the farthest from him of all living creatures, and they are the first to be introduced. Nearer to man are the denizens of the

air, for they breathe the same element and make their abodes around him, and they are the next to be introduced. Last come the tribes of the dry land, who are the nearest of all to man, being fellow-occupants with him of the same soil. And therefore again I claim that the order adopted in the cosmogony is a proof of its being governed by an ideal conception, and not by a supernatural knowledge of the facts which modern science is unveiling to us regarding the early history of our globe.

BROWNLOW MAITLAND.

SIR,—Referring to the Rev. Prebendary Bassett's sermon on the Biblical account of the Creation in the PULPIT of May 14th, and my remarks on it in that of the 4th June, I write again to mention a suggestion on the subject which has been made to me in conversation by the Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, Dean of Armagh, who is willing that it should be given to you.

The following is the structure of Genesis, ch. 1 :—"On the first day was created the light; on the second the visible expanse (see margin) of the sky; on the third day the waters of the ocean were gathered together so as to let the dry land appear, and the land was clothed with herbage and trees."

The order of the first three days' creation was thus:

1. The heaven of light.
2. The heaven of air and clouds.
3. Ocean, and earth with its vegetation.

The second three days' creation corresponds to the first as follows:

4. The sun, moon, and stars.
5. The fishes and birds.
6. The beasts of the earth and man.

Thus, in the first three days were created the three concentric spheres of light, air, and water and land; and in the second three days the creatures which are formed to move in them respectively—the heavenly bodies, the birds, and the beasts with man.

I have two remarks of my own to add to this. First, the position of the fishes in the order of creation appears somewhat anomalous.

Secondly, the grouping is not scientific, but artistic. Herbage and trees, which from a scientific point of view would be associated with animals, are treated from a painter's point of view as belonging to the earth. I do not make this an objection; on the contrary, it rather tends to remove a difficulty.

The foregoing appears to be the best attempt yet made to explain this passage from the point of view of the inspired writer.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, June 15th, 1892.

THE CATECHISM IN SCHOOLS.

SIR,—With respect to the teaching of the Catechism in Church Schools, where of necessity there are many children of Nonconformists, who must either have Church of England teaching or none at all, might it not be a solution of the difficulty that the Catechism should be taught during the week, *minus* the Sacraments, Creed, and other parts touching on doctrines obnoxious to Nonconformists, and that these parts should form the subjects for Sunday-school teaching? I sympathise entirely with those who dissent from the Church of England as regards its doctrine being taught to their children. We have no right whatever to stuff it down children's throats willy-nilly; but no Nonconformist would object to his child being taught the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, and the Catechism explanation of them.

HENRY BELL,
Vicar of Muncaster.

PROTECTION OF MOURNERS AT THE GRAVESIDE.

SIR,—Kindly permit me to state, in reference to the meeting advertised elsewhere in your columns, to be held next week at 21, Carlton House Terrace, that cards of invitation can be had on application to the Church House, Westminster, or to myself.

F. LAWRENCE, Hon. Sec.,
Funeral Reform Association.

Westow Vicarage, York,
June 13th, 1892.

FUNERAL REFORM.

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT, K.G., has contributed two guineas to the funds of the Church of England Burial, Funeral, and Mourning Reform Association.

The Archdeacon of London will preside at a Conference of Members of the Council, Local Hon. Secs., and other members of the Society at the Church House, June 20th, at 3.30 p.m.

Lady Frederick Cavendish has given the use of her house, at 21, Carlton House Terrace, for a drawing-room meeting to be held on Tuesday, June 21st, at 4.30 p.m., when it is proposed to issue an appeal from the ladies of England urging the exercise of simplicity and economy in all funeral observances, and advocating every available protection in inclement weather at the graveside. Cards of invitation may be had on application to the Hon. Sec. Funeral Reform Association, Church House, Westminster, S.W.

The Lord Bishop of Wakefield will preside at the Fourteenth Annual Meeting at the Church House, on Thursday, June 23rd, at 2.30 p.m.

The Annual Sermon will be preached by the Ven. Archdeacon Sinclair in St. Paul's Church, Onslow Square, S.W., on Sunday, June 26th, at 3.30 p.m., when a collection will be made on behalf of the Society.

The assured income of the Society from annual subscriptions is less than £200. The Council earnestly desire to raise this to £500.

Mr. Byron Reed, M.P. for East Bradford, has presented to Parliament a petition promoted by the Church of England Burial Reform Association, praying for the concentration in the Local Government Board of the authority now divided between that Board and the Home Office in regard to the regulation of interments. This divided authority has long been a source of difficulty in respect of Burial Reform.

DEAN COWIE has returned from the south of France to Exeter, but is reported to be "still seriously ill."

THE Bishop of Oxford has just opened a new labour-home of the Church Army in Oxford. His lordship expressed himself in warm sympathy with the work.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS

Ayscough, Rev. Thomas, M.A. ; Rector of Cradley, Hereford.
Bacon, Rev. Harry Vivian, M.A., late Vicar of Birstwith ; Rector of Barrowden, near Stamford, Rutlandshire.
Barnes, Rev. H. B., Vicar of Ilford ; Rector of Chelsfield, near Chislehurst.
Blucke, Rev. R. S. K., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Shenton, Nuneaton ; Rector of Bradden, Northamptonshire.
Breay, Rev. William Henry, B.A. ; Chaplain, Ingmire mission-hall, Sedbergh.
Dickerson, Rev. R. C., M.A. ; Licensed Public Preacher in the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.
Earle, Rev. Charles Stratford, B.A. ; Rector of Little Langford, Wilts.
Emery, Rev. H., M.A., Curate of St. Alban's, Rochdale; Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Hopwood.
Filleul, Rev. Samuel Edward Valpy, M.A. ; Rector of All Saints', Dorchester, Dorset.
Griffiths, Rev. Daniel, late Rector of Trevilan, Cardiganshire ; Vicar of Llangranog, Cardiganshire.
Hanham, Rev. Abdiel, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Sittingbourne, and Chaplain of Milton Union ; Rector of Goodnestone, and Vicar of Graveney, Faversham.
Henderson, Rev. Alexander, B.A., late Curate of St. Andrew's, Cardiff; Rector of Burton, Pembrokeshire.
Hicks, Rev. Canon, E. L., M.A., Warden of Hulme Hall and Honorary Canon of Worcester ; Canon Residentiary of Manchester Cathedral and Rector of St. Philip's, Salford.
Kendall, Rev. J. F., Vicar of Great Tew and Little Tew ; Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the deanery of Deddington.
Lingham, Rev. George ; Vicar of Cosby, Leicester.
Lunt, Rev. James, M.A., Rector of Walcot St. Swithin, Bath ; Surrogate for the diocese of Bath and Wells.
Marson, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Clevedon ; Surrogate for the diocese of Bath and Wells.
Mayhew, Rev. Cyril, Secretary of the Pastoral Order of the Holy Ghost ; Chaplain of Deesa-cum-Mount-Abu ; Surrogate.
Moberly, Rev. Walter Allan, M.A., Vicar of the Church of the Ascension, Blackheath ; Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Sydenham.
Morgan, Rev. Morgan, late Curate of Llanbarn-fawr, Cardiganshire ; Vicar of Bangor, Cardiganshire.
Parker, Rev. Canon, M.A., Licensed Public Preacher in the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.
Rackham, Rev. R. B., M.A. ; Licensed to Officiate in the diocese of Chester.
Raynes, Rev. H. A., M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Hampstead ; Vicar of Christ Church, Warley, Essex.
Richardson, Rev. E. S., Curate of St. Philip's, Bradford-road, Manchester ; Rector of St. Paul's, Stretford-road, Hulme.
Thomas, Rev. William Atterbury, B.A., late Rector of Cregrina-with-Llanbadarn-y-Garreg, Radnorshire ; Rector of Bleddfa, Radnorshire.
Tomlinson, Rev. George, Curate of St. Paul's, Royton, Oldham ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Philip's Mission district, in the parish of Nelson, Great Marsden, Burnley.
Walker, Rev. David, M.A. ; Vicar of Grinton, Yorkshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Chavasse, Rev. Ludovick T., M.A., at Bromley, on the 9th inst., aged 63.
Gossett, Rev. Isaac Henry, formerly Vicar of the parish, at Westward Ho ! in the parish of Northam, on the 8th inst., aged 75.
Irby, Rev. Thomas William, for fifty years Rector of the parish, at Rushmere Rectory, on the 8th inst., aged 75.
Liddle, Rev. William Wren, M.A., at Cowley, on the 8th inst., aged 68.
Pughe, Rev. Philip Alfred, Vicar of St. Anne's, Bewdley, at St. Thomas's Home, London, on the 6th inst., aged 31.
Puckle, Rev. Benjamin Hale, J.P., at Grafham Rectory, on the 8th inst.
Ransome, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Vicar of Kirkoswald and Hon. Canon of Carlisle, on the 7th inst., aged 63.
Todd, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of the parishes of Newton and Haceby, formerly first Rector of Holy Trinity, and some time Senior Curate of Leeds Parish Church, at the Rectory, on the 7th inst., aged 79.

A BARRISTER'S OPINION.

Brain and Nerve Exhaustion.—"I have only been waiting until my complete recovery to give a testimony to the wonderful effect of your Electropathic Belt treatment. When I first consulted you three years ago, I had almost resigned hope of being anything but a complete invalid all my life. At that time my vital energy was so low that I was quite incapacitated for work of any kind. The very least effort of the brain caused severe headache, and if sustained for more than an hour at a time exhausted me so that I could neither understand nor write a simple English sentence. Something under an hour twice or thrice daily was the utmost that I could do at such light work even as the reading of the newspaper or letter writing. It was the same with violent physical exercise. If I exceeded an hour at lawn tennis I exhausted myself for days. For three years I had been in pursuit of health. I had consulted more than one of the most eminent physicians, and followed out their *régime* with scrupulous care. I had given a six months' trial to hydropathy. I had tried foreign travel, and at the end I was no better than I was at the beginning. From the time I put myself in your hands I began to improve, and as soon as I invested in the electropathic appliances you recommended, my improvement was rapid. I have regained all the vigour, both of body and of mind, that I had lost, and now I am completely restored to health again. Since electropathy has restored me to health, I think no one need despair who can and will give it a fair trial. My belief is that it is of far greater value than all the other curative agencies that medical skill has employed. To it I owe my health, and, therefore, the happiness of my life."—F. Arthur Sibly, Barrister-at-Law, M.A., LL.M. (Cantab), Haywards-field, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

A LITTLE SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—If your constitutions are enfeebled through overwork, worry, or excesses, Mr. Harness's Electropathic Belts will speedily restore you to health, strength, and vigour. The mild continuous currents of electricity which they are guaranteed to imperceptibly generate will most assuredly vitalise every organ, nerve, and muscle of the body. These are not rash statements, but are actual facts, based on many years' practical experience, and can be confirmed by thousands of living witnesses. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), of 52, Oxford-street, London, W., publish (gratis) a book containing hundreds of unsolicited testimonials, the originals of which may be personally inspected at that address. They have been sent by all classes of men and women who have been completely cured of nervous and rheumatic affections, liver and kidney disorders, organic and functional derangements, by simply wearing these invigorating, health-restorine appliances. All who are able to visit the company's Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford-street, London, W., and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, should do so as soon as possible ; and those who cannot call should write for descriptive pamphlet and book of testimonials, which will be sent, gratis and post-paid, to any address on application. All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential.

The Church of England Pulpit.

NEO-PLATONISM AND SOCIALISM HOSTILE TO CHRISTIANITY.

By the Rev. F. W. BUSSELL, M.A., Fellow, Lecturer and Chaplain of Brasenose College, Oxford.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, March 13th, 1892.*

"For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord."—Eph. v. 8.

IN a season when the Church bids us escape from the claims of society to the solitude of our own hearts, and search there without reference to any outward standard of well-doing if we are making progress, it is not amiss to consider the teaching of our faith as to an opposition of principles in things, each of which invites our adhesion, and to compare or contrast it with other systems of metaphysics or morals.

In the very depths of our heart lies a conviction of such doubleness of things, which is effaced neither by the spiritual consolation and joy of the Christian message, nor by the material comfort of modern life, nor by the complacent utterances of science, telling us that this an obsolete duel of warring principles has been since reconciled, or proved to be a complete illusion. But the antithesis of matter and spirit, actual and ideal, the new man and the old, the higher or lower nature, is too familiar, too firmly settled in the universal mind to be dislodged by reason or argument, however vigorously we may use these weapons to drive out a supposed prejudice, or induce belief. In vain. So long as the seventh chapter of the Romans remains a faithful picture of the natural man, and of his inward doubts and warfare—and can we look forward to a time when this will represent him no longer?—so long will this deep-seated belief influence our faith and our conduct.

Yet modern science, in an age when, to judge by current fiction, this saddening consciousness is keener than ever, thinks to close up the impassable gulf by a simple fiat, and proclaims in tones of triumph the absolute union and identity of the two.

A historian of philosophy writes: "The period of modern times, on the contrary, is marked in the main by the development of the consciousness of restored unity, and hence also of the reconciliation and freedom of the human spirit." But these few fundamental ideas in the mind of each, so weak, it may seem, so unreasonable, so easily refuted, will not give way to the logic of discovery. Nothing appeals to hearers with such force as one of those bold statements, like this in our text, of that antithesis, in which we are reminded of the undying enmity of opposing principles. There, the conviction survives stubbornly enough, that each of us is twofold, and that the outer world and the powers beyond it are twofold also. In spite of vehemence in outward profession, the doubt remains.

Of all the processes of the natural world that are used to convey spiritual meaning, none, I suppose, has been so frequently in men's minds and on their lips as the image of darkness and light. Let us first examine this symbolical use of light to express the first cause, in various systems of religion or speculation, and then pass to the other side and attempt to understand what is of our faith as to the kingdom of darkness.

Mankind, we have said, has seized on the simple experience of day and night, of recurrent light and gloom, to represent this duel, or at least that alternation, of contraries. In such metaphor they seek to convey the mystery of the world's origin, as well as the irradiation of that smaller world, the soul, with the influence of the Deity.

And, in a certain sense, is not that process of creation repeated each morning? Creation, viewed as the descent of the most spiritual of the elements,—as the pouring down of sizes, shapes, colours, and properties into a dark formless inert mass, or space below? Creation, viewed not as the spontaneous springing up and unfolding of qualities already there, but as a distinct gift from some other region at once so different from and yet so indulgent to ours? Creation, viewed as the bountiful infusion of the principle of life into something that is more than half alien, and even hostile? In the dark, things are unfamiliar; we have lost the means of discerning hues and outlines: if we wake and wander abroad, all objects have a blank and monotonous likeness; if we sleep, it is as though at night the world and its dwellers were dead. But as soon as the sun restores vision to the seer, and limit to the visible, giving back again to us that channel of communion with the forms outside, the miracle of the first summons from nothing seems repeated, day by day.

Not without reason, then, have men chosen this familiar figure to represent Creation, and the action of Deity upon nature and man; the descent of light and heat into a void, or indistinguishable mass. It is light that distinguishes the objects of our sight; it is fire that will severely test the value of our works, and purify ourselves.

It is needless for me to enlarge upon the natural result of such type in the fire-worship of the East. It has ever been difficult for men to decide how far the Deity is identical with his gifts and ope-

* This sermon appeared in the *Oxford Magazine*. Vol. XXXIII.—No. 861.

rations; just as it is hard to discover the exact value of the image or symbol of Divine presence. In the curious reverence of the Parsee for the earthly element we have a matter-of-fact acceptance of a religious allegory,—unfamiliar method in oriental systems.

The Greek mind did not immediately give to fire the supreme place of honour in the building of the world; but, once suggested, fire occupied in every system the most exalted position among the elements, and was believed to be, or to represent most nearly, the *fons vitæ*, instrument nearest to the Creator's hand. Heracleitus, while he allows to fire this initiative, making it pass down, as in some dance-movement, the line of elements to coldness and death, and to repass upwards to renewed heat and life, still does not really give a constant and unchangeable existence to fire. To him it is like some monarch, never in his palace or in his rightful robe, but masquerading in perpetual disguise among the meanest of his subjects.

And so when clearer vision apprehended that no pre-eminence can be given to any one of the elements as the supreme agent in Creation, (for all alike pass into the others, and, in such ceaseless process, decay,) nevertheless, if neither sun nor fiery change is thus worshipped, they are retained as fitting and most worthy symbols of the unseen power that holds together and quickens nature. In Plato, as sight is the noblest of our senses, so it is still used in a figure to signify the organ of mental intelligence: as the sun in the heavens is the most glorious and beneficent of objects created, so is it most suitable to represent the majesty of the invisible King.

In such terms of sun and light he expresses the stages of the soul's pilgrimage to its Creator: enclosed here in a prison-house of darkness, it sees only by the light of a flame many degrees removed from the true fire; nor can it, when actually released, at once turn its eyes thither unflinchingly, but must accustom itself by practice, by degrees, to look to the Sun of the spiritual world, as dazzling as the visible sun.

Aristotle, in a fragment preserved in Cicero, *De Naturâ Deorum* (ii. 95), sees in the "magnitude, the beauty, the efficacy of the sun, which creates day by diffusing light over the whole heaven," not so much a symbol of God's essence, but, as we might expect, rather an irrefragable argument of His existence and providence.

In the period after Aristotle, the Greek mind, haunted by that feeling of duplicity in things, torturing itself and others with clever and insoluble presentations of the same riddle, let go, in the morbid and theatrical isolation of the sage, any sense of the descent of light from another sphere; and losing its early trustfulness in the goodness of nature, settled itself, with more or less pretence at submission, in an attitude of defiance against fortune and the world around. We need not look here for the employment of this metaphor of light; for light and the sun compel men to look above and beyond themselves rather than to contemplate their own dignity, their own misfortunes, self-centred, and self-pitying.

But, after the sanction of Christian usage, the Gnostics revive this symbol in their florid imagery. Attracted by the new doctrine of deliverance and of Christ's mission as a Saviour, without waiting to inquire from what man is to be saved, they present us with a strange confusion of Christian language and Oriental ideas. Adapting, it may be, from the first chapter of St. John the simile of an "imprisoned light," they maintain that the spirit which Christ came to deliver is a refraction of the supercelestial rays, lost and detained in this dark world of "becoming"; an irradiation fallen from heaven, unconsciously or by an error, and kept here till the Saviour, Who is not thus detained, can reclaim and recall it to its home again. Strange indeed this doctrine sounds to us! We are familiar with the Stoic title for the soul, *ἀπόσπασμα* or *μόριον τοῦ θεοῦ* (fragment or particle of the Deity), but not with the view that the world-process is a deplorable though needful struggle to recover a lost portion of Deity, and join it once more to its parent.

"We owe no duty," said the elect by some privilege of birth (*προτέρημα φύσεως*), "to the darkness which we cannot illuminate; our Father helplessly lost among visible objects of the world below this part of His plenitude (*πλήρωμα*), and the pain and toil of human history is this seeking again for the lost piece of silver, this straying gleam of light, this wandering sheep, taken in the snares of sensible existence." In their absolute and irreconcilable dualism, their eternal and fatal antithesis of light and darkness, they may remind us in some measure of the selfish indifference of certain Calvinistic teachers; but the entire attitude of Gnostic carelessness and complacency is thoroughly typical of men's temper in that age, disinclined to allow the ties of duty and society, needing in the political world the "present deity" of Cæsar; in the religious world, the sympathy and compassionate example of Christ.

Thus Marcion regards light and darkness as eternal "principles, and Jesus as a third being, reconciling their antagonism"; he is careful to distinguish the Creator of the world from the God of Light.

Valentinus explains, by this same simile, the duplicity of things; Achamoth, in her half-fruitless glimpses into the splendour above, forms the nether world, partly of her joys at such vision, partly of her fears and disappointment when the light is gone.

"The essence of the first principles," said the Sethians, in Hippolytus, "are light and darkness: in the space between is a pure spirit; not as wind or breeze, or light air, but as it were the fragrance of myrrh." Light being thus above, darkness

below, and mediate the fragrance, "it is the nature of light, like some sun, to send its rays down from above into the low-lying darkness. Now the darkness is altogether wise and not foolish; it knows that if the light be lifted away, it will remain desolate, powerless, unilluminate: therefore, with all prudence and cleverness, it strains to hold imprisoned in itself this brilliance, this fiery spark of the upper light, and the fragrance of the mediant spirit."

So too the Docetes, according to Hippolytus, believed "that the pure perfect light of the world of ideas, not shapeless or idle, but having in itself innumerable forms of animals, shed its radiance from above into the gloom below. And thus, what was once chaos received form and stability, receiving ideas from heaven." The Creation, as told in the first chapter of Genesis, according to their strange notion, was an attempt to present this fall and imprisonment of the heavenly "characters." "God severed the light from the darkness." The god of this world delights to torment the detained portions of that Divine light.

In such systems, then, darkness is a positive and malevolent power, and the world, evil in itself, but containing rays of goodness, is the kingdom, the creation of an independent Prince of Evil. In striking contrast to this dualism is the religious philosophy of the Neo-Platonists. For, in this opposition of light and gloom, the question will always arise, is this darkness to be regarded as a mere defect, or a consciously hostile principle; a weakness of a lower, or a rebellion of an equal, nature?—in a word, is it positive or negative in its character?

Plotinus, opposed to the belief that evil is something real, seeing, in fact, in our creation the best of all possible worlds, and noting in evil a mere lack or emptiness, uses to describe the process of creation only those metaphors which preserve the idea of continuity. Unlike the Gnostic and Eastern dualism, it is not light and darkness, God and matter, arrayed in perhaps eternal hostility to each other, which together fabricate this world of mingled happiness and pain; but the entire creation is a welling forth, an overflow of the full cup of the Divine *goodness*, that one only quality of which he cannot deprive the first principle. Far otherwise than in the Gnostic theory, the process here is deliberate and orderly: nothing interferes with its harmony. The oneness and continuity, the sympathy and concord in the universe, is a theme he is never tired of repeating. He is careful to avoid any term of metaphor which may suggest "a breaking or falling away of a part from the whole." He uses the simile of a cup always running over; of a voice which, although it sounds in outer air and reaches the minds of other men, yet remains still with him who utters it; of a centre from which spread innumerable rays, stretching out to a circumference, yet never separated from their common source; and lastly, in more than forty passages, this image of light is summoned to his aid, in the difficult task of explaining how God gave birth to the world, how God may be born too in us.

Light is chosen to figure forth this genial system because it is all-bountiful, grudging to none, shining on the unjust as on the just: ever remaining still and far-distant, its rays penetrate everywhere, untarnished by contact with lower nature; resembling the ἰδέαι of Plato, the "powers" of Philo. If some are blind to it, that is only a defect of their nature, or presence of darkness and mist in it. "If you clear this from the eyes," says Platonic optimism, so alien to the conceptions of our faith, "all men will at once make for the light, which even now in their restless striving after earthly beauty was the object of their vagrant pursuit."

As I have already said, in this monistic system of Plotinus there are two divisions—the spread of light from its fount, and the return thither again. The former is his theory of creation, of the origin of the visible and spiritual worlds, the unfolding of the many from the one; the latter his theory of ethics, of the duty and privilege of each soul: the former is a speculative, the latter a moral inquiry; and yet, as F. D. Maurice reminds us, "the latter rests wholly on the former." Which side first presented itself to his mind it would be impossible to say, which problem—the origin of life in the world of nature and intelligence, or the personal needs of the soul of man? But in both he uses impartially the symbol of light.

And first of the overflow of the Divine Goodness into creation (ii. 27, Volkm.): "There is, as it were, a certain lustrous centre, and after this a circle shining out from this, and to these again a second circle, light of light; but outside these there is no more a circle of light, but this space, in default of light of its own, [is] in need of illumination from other. The great light remains still and sheds its radiance, and the ray passes onwards from it, the rest join in shedding light, some staying still, others attracted [downwards] by the refulgence of the objects they illumine" [souls amid earthly cares].

Again, ii. 370. "But if, making a small luminous body like a centre, you were to put around it a much larger spherical and translucent body, so that the light within shone on all that was around; when to the bulk outside there was no other source of light (αὐγή)—should we not then say that this inner light itself is undisturbed and undergoes nought, but remaining still, yet comes to all the bulk without, and that the tiny light therein beheld has occupied what is outside [without itself stirring]?"

ii. 365. "Shall we then say that it is present, or that it indeed remains by itself, but that potencies proceed from it into all the world? For so they say that souls are as it were rays, and therefore while it is firm seated itself, they are sent, one

hither, one thither, on various missions abroad to become living things."

For (i. 387) in another passage, this is the function of soul, to receive and transmit the light. "Ever illumined, and having the light perpetually, it gives it to those that come after, and they are held together and bathed in this flood of light, and enjoy life as far as they can; just as if men warmed themselves as best they could, from a fire lying somewhere in their midst."

He rebukes the theory of unconscious irradiation of matter as held by the Valentinian Achamoth, and indignantly asks of these Gnostic world-haters, "What fairer image of the world invisible can there be than our earth? What other sun better than this visible orb, after that unseen sun of the spiritual region?" (i. 188.)

But, if the soul lets the heavenly light filter through to the orders below, and in over-solicitude for natural objects, forgets, in their very brilliancy, the true source of light that illusively returns to her again as if it came from them:—she becomes like the moon, a light to others, though herself dead. The ethics of each soul is the reverse process to creation.

ii. 202. "Then it is right to believe we have seen the Blessed Vision, when the soul of a sudden receives light; . . . . then must we think he is present, when, like some other god at the summons of a worshipper, he comes and illuminates the house. Otherwise, if soul receives no radiance, he was not there; but if he illuminate it, it has what it sought; and this is the true end of the soul, to reach hold of that light, and by itself behold it, ... as we see not the sun by any other light but its own. How may this be? Away with all else."

When he depicts heaven, he cannot banish the idea of light, as from God goodness only survives of human qualities.

ii. 235. "There, is life at ease, and all pure delights: there all is transparent, nothing is dark or repellent of light; each is to each manifest to its inmost part and in all respects; for each has all things within itself, and again sees all in other, so that everywhere are all things, and all is all, and each is all, the glitter is infinite. For each of them is great; for even the small is great, and all stars there are as the sun, and each one is again the sun, and all things."

You may describe the path and passage to this kingdom, but not the vision of the highest Himself: ii. 513 it is past knowledge, and dark with excess of light; as all other lights are put out by the sun, and in gazing at him you behold nothing but light.

ii. 522. "In this contemplation, Soul beholds as she should, herself and Him: herself decked with light, full of intelligible radiance, or rather light itself, pure and imponderable, having become, nay being, God."

Among Platonic speculators after Plotinus, no one gives such importance to the idea of light a the Emperor Julian. Like Aurelian, like Constantine himself in his early days, he is ὀπαδὸς τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, servitor of the Great King, a votary of that religion of light which invaded the whole Roman world under the name of Mithra, and which saw in the various divinities of Egypt and Greece but different names for the Sun-God;—

Εἷς Ζεύς, εἷς Ἀΐδης, εἷς Ἥλιός ἐστι Σάραπις.

To Julian, the Son, the visible sun (ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἥλιος) of Denys, is the external apparel, or sensible presentment of this second Deity, who springs from the first, and rules either world of sense or mind. From the dark inscrutable bosom of the beyond what is Mind, beyond Being, he arises luminous; life, self-conscious and yet self-contained, embodying in himself the implicit qualities, there and yet not there, in the abyss or ground of being. "Let us worship in reverent silence this awful Being, but pour forth our hymns to His Son, the radiant orb of mental and physical day." Like the rest of his school, Julian full of admiration for "the beautiful universe," refuses to see any dualism between nature and spirit; the sun lights up both worlds, and gives them life.

Thus, to a certain degree, the need of a visible symbol evokes from the purely spiritual religion of Plotinus, the Mithraic adoration of the sun. Νοῦς, the second person, is not only imaged in our sun, but is there behind it, identical with its very being.

In contemporary Christian thought the same image is used to express dimly the mystery of the Trinity in Unity; being, light, and heat. We find it in Justin and Athenagoras. In support of the orthodox view of this relation it is employed by Tertullian (*Adv. Pr.* 14) to show the incomprehensibility of the Father, for we know not "real substance of the sun, but only its rays which are shed upon the earth." It is perverted by Sabellius to support his heresy; for "as the sun," he says, "receives back into itself the ray that went forth from it, so the Divine Λόγος, after acquiring personality in Christ, returned again into the Father."

When Clement wishes to welcome the good among Pagans, as children of a common father, he says, the Divine Λόγος is "everywhere poured out (*Str.* v. 3); like the light of the sun. He has *illuminated* the souls of men from the beginning."

And Origen by the same simile supports his doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son,—"as light always begets its own lustre." No metaphors and no titles of God are so frequent in Augustine as those borrowed from light; at least in that early stage of his Neo-Platonic Christianity, before he begins to move away from religious philosophy to rigorous dogmatics.

But it is especially in "Denys the Areopagite," another great Christian student of the Neo-Platonists, that we find these figures of Light. "Every good gift" comes to us "from the Father of

Lights by illumination; passing from the source and centre through successive grades of angelic natures, each of which transmits it to the rank beyond." So, in the hierarchy of the Church, that copy of the invisible, the priesthood is named the τάξις φωταγωγική. This is the highest kind of comparison,—to liken God to the sun, "who, not by choice or compulsion, but by the very law of his nature lighteneth all that can partake of his light, according to its own special capacity. So, too, also the Good (above the sun, as the original is above a poor likeness) in the same manner, sends abroad to all things that are, the beams of his whole goodness." (*Div. Nom.*)

So in the *Celestial Hierarchy* he enlarges on the same metaphor: "in the same way does the Source of visible and invisible order display to the highest beings, in first and plenary irradiation, the brilliancy of its own light, by a perfectly blessed diffusion; and through these the following orders partake of the Divine ray. For these, first knowing God, and longing above all things for Divine virtue, in their bounty stimulate those after them to rivalry, ungrudgingly distributing the bright flash that comes over them; and these in turn again to their inferiors."

"Now," he continues, as if to harmonise this Platonic doctrine with the appointed means and channels of grace in the Church's organisation,—"Now to all the illuminate, the fount and origin of their illustration is by nature indeed God, as cause of existence and sight, as the very essence of light; but by position each is indebted to the rank immediately above it; for through this, as through a canal, or glass, or horn, are the Divine lights transmitted."

But it must not be forgotten that Denys, as he looks beyond the names of God to His nameless and unknowable essence, can see, also, beyond the ordinary vehicles of this Divine radiance, a possibility of immediate union: there, in fact, in the Divine darkness (θεῖος γνόφος) of the beginning of his *Myst. Theol.*, which is gloom above light (or by reason of excess of light); towards which images of light are but stages in progress. There, "in denial, in blindness, and in ignorance, we lose ourselves in God."

Part II.

We have seen how this metaphor of light is largely used in all ages to express the action of deity in the world. Illumination is chosen as the physical process most fitted to convey by a sign spiritual influence.

Accepted alike by the best schools of speculation among Pagans, as also by Christian writers, few will deny the aptitude of this symbol. But it is in the other term of our text, "sometime darkness," that we shall discover a variety of sentiment: and to this matter I would specially ask your attention.

Is this darkness, whence the world was called, out of which in our text each of us is summoned, a mere void where light is not? Is it a negation, a state of weakness to be illuminated by compassion? Or does it represent a rival principle, a conscious rebellion, as I have termed it, against the Father of Lights, to be overcome by warfare?

It is precisely here that Platonism, even now a danger to the purity of Church doctrine,—in its strong assertion of the unity of the world's source, of the essential beauty and goodness of our visible creation, and in its intense indignation at Eastern dualism,—has tended to work mischief. Not only does it depreciate the activity and consciousness of God's benevolence (for instance, Proclus tells us that "the higher orders do not bend down to the lower, but 'tis the lower that must gaze upward to their superiors," and we have already noticed the dangerous expression of Denys,)—but it makes the individual absolute master of his spiritual fate; for at any moment, if he turn his eye thither, he can find the highest present in him. It is ever there at his side, waiting for, but not aiding, his clearness of vision.

These speculators, then, start from a firm belief in the oneness and goodness of the fount of life; but add, that in this case "there can be no place in creation which emanates from him for evil; save only so far as we may term that dark which is in its nature distant from the light, or unable, through lack of self-knowledge, to receive its rays."

The same firm conviction of God's absoluteness leads Augustine, in a system quite opposed to the Platonism of his early Christian treatises, to uphold God's authority at the cost of His justice. He allows evil, but seems to attribute it to God; the Platonists deny evil, because they cannot so attribute it.

And it is quite obvious that every argument which starts from the absolute unity of things must in logical sequence take refuge in one or other of those errors. "There is no evil, no darkness," or "God is the author of it"; of which I know not if the Platonist be not the better. The attempt to attribute an absolute unity and harmony to the world, as we see it, must be a failure. It is pathetic to see men disregard their instinctive sense of duplicity, and loudly proclaim the new-found "harmony of opposites" in our world. "The old debate, we are told, "the old imaginary struggle is over; the Christian religion, with its basis of pessimism, is but an hallucination, and gives place to the genial creed that all things are God." "As the founder of our religion, we acknowledge Spinoza; Bruno is the holy martyr for its truth—Bruno, whose enthusiasm for nature, commended to him in all its glowing sensuousness as his mistress, of necessity brought him into conflict with a vocation which, in the name of grace, demanded a perpetual and fruitless war against nature." Sin, it is added (and it is instructive to note the reappearance of these obsolete fallacies), is a mere

creation of the restraint of law, and will "disappear in a purely natural world."

"Evil," says Heine, "is a result of the arrangement of the world by spiritualists. . . . . Matter becomes evil only when it is forced into secret conspiracy against the usurping spirit, when it is stigmatised by the spirit, and then degrades itself through loss of self-respect, or when, with the hatred of despair, it avenges itself on the spirit."—"God is identical with the world."

German literary art of the close of the eighteenth century "aspires after a beatific identification with nature."

"Schelling," as he asserts, "re-establishes nature in its legitimate rights; he aimed at a reconciliation between mind and nature; he sought to reunite them in the eternal soul of the world."

He prophesies, "One day, when Humanity shall have regained robust health, when peace shall have been once more established between body and soul, and they live together again in primal harmony, it will be scarce possible for men to comprehend the unnatural enmity that Christianity has put between them."

But this passionate insistence on the unity and goodness of the world misleads few and comforts no one. It is strange, in an age that claims to be so scrupulously inductive, to have to complain that the ethical theories of the closet disregard the plainest facts of experience. Is sin found to be less a slavery because the notion of guilt is removed? Is the significance of Christ's person to evaporate in the allegory which these modern Gnostics accept so readily, as if we had need of a mere example, not of a personal Saviour, who, to satisfy our metaphysical search, must be true God; to assure us that our nature can conquer evil, must be true Man? Does the doubt (now so prevalent) as to the personality of "the prince of this world," really relieve us from any problem of moral or physical evil?

The course of this century is the history of a disillusion. Such noble enthusiasm at its outset, such high hopes for universal regeneration, such belief in the goodness of the natural heart, such promises of liberty and knowledge, and a life as of Paradise here on earth, for our descendants, if not for ourselves! What is the state of feeling as detected now by the clear-sighted?—

In fiction, a strange paradox, of loathing yet fascinated curiosity in the results of the natural and evil life of darkness; which loves to tear the veil from the enticements of sin, and expose not its agreeable but its terrible side. Is this the return, so lately promised, to Greek blitheness and harmony with nature?

And side by side, as the inevitable counterpart of that, a straining to open the secrets of the spiritual world in a revived Neo-Platonism, now mystic and abstracted in Fichte or Schelling as in Plotinus, now juggling and thaumaturgic as in Iamblichus.

And in the social world of man's being shall we see realised the dreams of optimism? The most consistent socialistic scheme is a deliberate reaction against the progress of the past hundred years; it resorts to rules of coercion and aid, then rejected with scorn; it distrusts the unit, and reduces him to slavery, not to a personal master, but to a committee; and for the stimulus of individual virtue and beneficence substitutes an automatic procedure of "charity," regulated by a sort of abstraction—the sum of the universal conscience of the nation, which is to guide and guard the weakness, and the corrupt conscience, of each. Patriotic interest is not increasing; and a century that began with promises of a golden age to follow the enfranchisement of all, finds it already necessary to enforce by penalty the performance of civil duties and privileges.

And so the dogmas of our faith, though sometimes thought obsolete, of human frailty, of inherent corruption, and propensity to evil, of the need of Divine grace, reappear invested with new authority. Yet the Church is, perhaps, tempted to adapt her own position and language to the fluctuating guesses and prejudices of the world, and must constantly remind herself of the fundamental basis of her creed in that antagonism of light and darkness; that she is in the world, not so much to redeem or renovate the world (that success is never promised to her) but to provide an asylum of refuge for those who would escape from the world to God.

"The greatest of all innovations," says an acute historian of human thought, "assumes at its appearance a hostile attitude towards what has hitherto existed:—'not peace, but a sword'!" "Call the complex of visible existence 'the world,' and the new spirit will reveal itself as the world's antagonist, as an object of hatred to the children of the natural world."

It contradicts (I would continue) the course of natural or social rule; directs the eye to a higher obligation than obedience to parental or political authority. Its Founder is born in opposition to this merely natural law, and died by a death, the most ignominious among all state penalties. If Stoicism revelled in paradox, so does Christianity, and more abundantly; though its startling expressions are not mere word-play, but novel and life-giving truths, the contrast between a real and a false world. It demands to be accepted without question, not by the exercise of reason and criticism, but on trust. It asks the sacrifice of all that men held (and I think still hold) dear in the life of sensation or of politics. As with the humility of the Socratic pretensions, it seemed by its very mildness to upset all preconceived notions as to the absolute value of the old physical, domestic, social life; to discredit their sanctions by teaching a higher law, which depends neither on the pride of the individual soul nor on the edicts of the State. It promises neither peace in the household nor success to the patriotic

hopes of a race; at its appearance the ambitious hopes of a proud nation, so long preserved in exile and misfortune, were ruthlessly cast down; and above the complacent comfort of family life, the Church has always elevated the merits and the ideal of celibacy and contemplation.

What then is this kingdom of darkness from which we are called to become children of light? We dismiss the Eastern fable (now accepted, now rejected by Platonism) that evil resides in matter, and is merely a temporary film over the soul's vision. In this view, as I have said, no idea of guilt is admissible; we cannot speak of the guilt of the unconscious; we must at once give up the sentiment of indignation for that of mere compassion.

Neither again are we allowed to assert an original opposition of Ahriman and Ormuzd, of two personal independent beings of light and darkness, whose field of eternal conflict is this neutral borderland of the visible world. Nor again may we gnostically suppose that the world is the fabrication of an angel, either actively malignant or only ignorant and of limited power, and that our redemption, the redemption of the elect, the "world-process," is a summoning back of a portion of Deity wrongfully detained.

What then are we as Churchmen allowed to say? Let me first state the axiom that Christianity only acknowledges a person, a will, and is only concerned with persons, with wills: all the rest may go. Evil then resides in rebellion of will, which may be eternal.

According to the self-defeating logic of the Platonic pantheist, the world-process is a toilsome ascent to the heights of personality in order to lose it again in absorption. It is therefore an easy and unanswerable refutation when Schopenhauer or Leopardi replies to this inconsistent optimism: "It was a pity for the unqualified ground to have thus issued into a conscious existence":—an existence which they have no difficulty in proving to be mostly painful and mistaken. We, the individuals, are thus sacrificed to give some infinite world-soul the experience that finite conscious existence is an error.

But from a Christian point of view, we, who because of our faith deny the world-process to be an error, see in it the ascent to the perfection of personality, not that it may be lost, like a drop in the ocean, but may continue for ever in the joys of conscious harmony with the First Cause. Christ is the long-expected mediator, the paradox of the one-many, of the ὅλον καὶ μέρος, the spectacle of a will, not submerged in self-effacement as some mystics maintain, but rejoicing precisely in this fulness, the entire willingness of its acquiescence in the Divine will. What is our conception of human life but as a difficult apprenticeship for heaven, and by no means an end in itself? The idea that this life is an end in itself is untenable, for joy in the present ends when reflection begins; and yet man is born for reflection!

Heaven! what is it but the crowning and consummation of the manifold in unity? rather the intelligent union than the ecstacy of Plotinus? not the destruction or sacrifice of the parts in the whole, but the presence of the whole in each part. Heaven is the sense of this acquired harmony with God, not congenital, but attained by effort and struggle with a depraved nature, the veritable guerdon of which is an everlasting consciousness of this attainment; not the physical conception of engulfment in nothingness, as with some Endymion of mysticism who has, but is not aware of, the full favour of heaven.

If true liberty, true happiness, consists just in the full submission to God's will, slavery and unhappiness will consist in submission to any finite will; and guilt is to turn away from the Source of being to worship a creature.

We are taught to believe that such apostasy of the will takes place, before man enters this world, in another purely spiritual. The kingdom of darkness exists not in the author of creation, not in an independent sovereign of adverse will, not in the vileness of matter, but in the perversion of our will from its true life; or, in language familiar alike to Christian, and pagan Platonist, and modern speculator, in the turning of the will from its repose in adoration of the one, to vagrancy (as Fichte expresses it) in the manifold and transient; to the worship of itself, or of that which it deems its own nature.

When man appears (for the first sin must occur from its very nature in a purely spiritual kingdom) he is anticipated by the temptation of a power already hostile to God. And by his act of homage to a sinful rebel ("all these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me") the world of nature and the free will of man pass as it were out of the kingdom of God, and into the tyranny of the Prince of Darkness.

Man sacrifices his free will to an alien master. The doctrine of original sin needs not to be supported by argument: it is a fact of human history; where, with increasing sense of what ought to be done, comes increasing weakness to do it.

Except in rare instances of diabolic cruelty man is the ἀκρατής, not the ἀκόλαστος. Christ comes not to preach a new creed, a new theory of conduct, but to deliver a will which has passed into slavery. That is a *fact*, however men may explain the *dogma* of inherited sin. "The evil that I would not, that I do." Christianity exists, not as the mediæval Church hoped, to conquer the world, but to give to the few faithful, "the elect" for whose sake the days are shortened, the message of recovery of a forfeited freedom, not a new code of behaviour.

But if an imprisoned free will is thus released, it is because it desires such release: an absolutely evil will cannot, because it will not, be saved.

Those who wish to get free can find release: homage is not compelled, nor is happiness forced on free beings; and the kingdom of darkness, called by St. John "the world" and its "prince," consists of those who will not turn.

Orthodox belief does not even tolerate the notion of a final ἀποκατάστασις of such; but with even more than Oriental insistence upon it maintains the eternal duality of good and evil.

I do not speak here of the moral lessons which follow such a belief in the existence of human wills, utterly alienate from God, which form an eternal kingdom of darkness. They are preached from every pulpit, and while our faith remains true to itself must always be the theme of our discourse. It is rather the doctrinal fact of this duplicity to which on this occasion I call notice, lest we be misled by the passionate craving for unity still prevalent, which in the nineteenth century has, in certain phases of thought, so strangely recalled the dreams of the third.

God is a power distinct, and in a sense opposed to, or over against the world, which is alienate from Him; we are called, because we feel the miserable doubleness of our nature and the slavery of our will, to cross over from darkness to light.

"Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord."

The mission of Christianity has not changed in the ages; and the Church need not adapt herself to the knowledge or progress of the human race. When man comes to be without consciousness of shame, uneasiness, and guilt; to be at natural peace with himself; to satisfy his discontent with the present, and his universal craving after the absent—which, contrary to socialistic promises, is ever parallel, not with the greatest misfortune, for that is a palliative, but with the greatest prosperity of society—when the seventh chapter of Romans ceases to describe the inner conflict—then will we acknowledge that the harmony is restored; that our faith preaches contentment, social progress, belief in the powers of the natural man, acquiescence in the present comfort of home or nation.

Until that time we shall try to win over persons, one by one, from slavery to the evil principle—evil to them, because it does not give happiness. We shall refuse to trust great schemes of universal improvement, the lazy method of those who love abstractions, and are tired of individuals; we shall ever point to the highest flight from the world, which alone partakes of the true light in its fulness; recognising the differences of the ideal capable of achievement by each, but not therefore lowering the best to a uniform and merely respectable standard. And we are confident in our militant attitude, for we have One who says, "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have—not converted, not reformed, but—I have overcome the world."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 1892.

"THE INJUDICIOUS HOOKER."

MR. GLADSTONE is busy dropping his baits in many waters, but not even his experience has saved him from a very bad cast. His whole proceedings on the question of the Eight Hours Day have been in harmony with his Home Rule conversions and convictions; but there is nothing in his previous career quite like his interview with the unfortunate Eight Hours delegates (to use a barbarism for the sake of brevity).

The men who, for various motives, are for limiting the labour hours of the country, by means unexplained and machinery unknown, at least knew what to expect from the Conservative leaders, who, not being professional vote-fishers, were at liberty to know and to speak their own minds. But it was otherwise with Mr. Gladstone. The Grand Old Fisherman was at his favourite diversion. First of all he would not fish; he would not even see the delegates. It was a sort of "I can't play with you any more" proceeding, calculated to stimulate the appetite. Then there was the thirst for information—perhaps there was something in it after all. The last scene was the interview in Carlton Gardens, where the poor delegates were verily fish out of water in more senses than one: the old angler played them incessantly, and finally, having landed them in triumph, pitched them back, so to speak, contemptuously into the stream.

In sober earnest, what can a man think of Mr. Gladstone's conduct with this deputation, except that he was simply fishing for their influence, and for an estimate of their power? What was the use of first of all asking for information and enlightenment before he could see the deputation, and then saying he was too old to have anything to do with them? All the information in the world could not

make Mr. Gladstone a day younger, and if he was already too old to take the question up, he might just as well have said so at first. But a straight answer is just what Mr. Gladstone seems unable to give, even when his mind is as nearly made up as he can manage. However, both parties in the interview seem to have pretty well understood what the other was after. The deputation knew that they had some sort of political influence to give, and that their business was to squeeze what they could out of Mr. Gladstone in return for it. It was, in fact, simply a question of the bait the angler chose to put upon his hook. Of course the deputation knew the difficulties in argument with which they would be met, they would have proved themselves most incompetent leaders otherwise. To suppose that men who have busied themselves with the practical side of agitation for years are ignorant of the elementary principles with which their proposals collide is absurd. But they put up with Mr. Gladstone's schooling with an eye to what was behind it, and what was in their minds was made clear enough by their significant references to the Election. More than once the deputation, entirely passing over Mr. Gladstone's arguments, repeat their hope that he would find himself able to give them some expressions of encouragement and sympathy in view of the General Election. They knew their man. Mr. Gladstone professes himself too old to attend to the subject; the deputation still press for his patronage; Mr. Gladstone shows them that their scheme is hopelessly bad in principle; the deputation still stick to the point, without any attempt at controversy, Will he patronise it? Mr. Gladstone further proves that the scheme is impossible in practice, but the deputation go steadily in for his patronage all the same. There is probably no politician in Europe who would be approached in quite the same way, and he was invited, over and over again, to act and speak in opposition to his openly-expressed principles and convictions. The Conservative leaders were not asked to modify their opinions on the score of the coming Election: such a suggestion would probably have abruptly closed the interview.

This is the way in which Mr. Gladstone is angling for votes; we are convinced it is injudicious. Such tricks have unhappily succeeded, not once or twice. But when they are openly recognised, and men fulfilling quasi-public functions calculate upon them, and openly treat with a political leader as a mere fisher after votes, the end is not far off. And that end will, we are convinced, be the complete defeat of the party and the leader who employ such devices.

THE Bishop of Durham has appointed Mr. John George Wilson (M.A., Worcester College, Oxford), solicitor, Durham, his legal secretary.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL DESTRUCTION.

SIR,—I welcome with much pleasure the remarks of Mr. Murphy in yesterday's PULPIT, and hope his valuable assistance will be continued.

I have referred to various translations of the passage 1 Cor. iii. 15, rendered in our Authorised Version, "he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." In the Vulgate it is, "ipse autem salvus erit; sic tamen quasi per ignem." In Luther's version, "so doch als durchs feuer." In the Russian independent translation, made from the Greek, the preposition seems to mean "out of the fire." In the Douay Version it is, "he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." In Dr. Young's translation it is, "himself shall be saved, but so as through fire." And in that connected with the "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," by Conybeare and Howson, the rendering is, "but shall be saved as it were through the flames." Whether "by" or "through" is the most correct rendering, it seems clear to me that suffering by the redeemed in a future life is indicated, and that was all I wished to set forth in my letter.

The conceptions of "Vindex" are so different from mine that, whatever degree of good faith and honesty of purpose we may both have, we can hardly avoid misunderstanding each other frequently. We seem to have very little common standing-ground.

My words in the PULPIT of 28th May to which "Vindex" refers, seem clear enough. I charged him with saying that the final result of the scheme of Redemption would be the salvation of some, and the endless ruin of some; or, in other words, that the scheme of Redemption would not accomplish the salvation of all.

I agree that it is of importance for us to ascertain in what sense the early Christian writers understood the words translated "destruction" and "perishing," especially those whose mother tongue was Greek. As far as I am able to judge, the most eminent writers, and the Christian community generally, held until the fifth century that the destruction and perishing would not be endless. Their language clearly implied the belief that all sin would be forgiven, I will bring forward numerous passages in proof of this. Historical records which I have looked into seem to indicate that the primitive bright and loving views of God's purposes were forcibly suppressed through the influence of Augustin with the Imperial Power.

I do not believe it is correct to represent the Saviour as declaring that the sin against the Holy Spirit will never be forgiven. Dr. Young renders the words in Mark iii. 29, "hath not forgiveness to the age, but is in danger of age-during judgment." An esteemed friend who is a good Greek scholar, translated them, "hath not forgiveness to the age (*ouk echei aphesin eis ton aiôna*) but is guilty of a sin of the age (*aionion*). Besides I do not see that there is any clear definition as to what the sin is.

I perceive that "Vindex" objects to my account of the impression which the teaching of his school of thought produces on my mind. I do not wish to misrepresent those doctrines, but to bring out clearly their real features, which are often enveloped in vague language, and so mixed up with opinions which all

Christians hold, that it is difficult to trace the boundary lines. I have just referred to a very clever book, "Life in Christ," by Rev. E. White. I derive therefrom substantially the same impressions concerning the prospects for the intelligent universe, as from the statements of "Vindex." If only those are saved, who are united to Christ by a living faith in this life, by far the greater part of Adam's race must perish. The holders of the complete destruction theory say "they will be destroyed soul and body." That constitutes my idea of annihilation. "Vindex" says they will not be destroyed "till after the final judgment." But he does not indicate their condition from the period of death until the judgment. It must be either torment or unconsciousness.

In any case it is a most dreary picture of the expected results of God's wise, firm, equitable, and benevolent rule over His creatures, and of the wondrous love and self-sacrifice manifested in the Incarnation and the Atonement, with all the spiritual influences, which are plainly capable of transforming darkness into light, and sins of deepest dye into holiness.

I think it is a legitimate test to ask, whether such representations tend to inspire love and reverence towards God; and whether they are consistent with the grand proclamation, "God is Love"? We might also inquire, "Why should such horrors be perpetrated?" If the vilest sinners have been restored, why should not all be restored?

Can the redeemed be joyful under such circumstances? Will not love and compassion prompt to earnest effort and even to self-sacrifice?

In regard to freedom of the will, I believe one of the objects of permitting the turmoil, sufferings, and disorders which afflict the intelligent creation is to instruct enlighten, and train, so that we may be able to understand impressively what is good and what is not, and become qualified to select the true and beneficial, and to reject the false and noxious. J. B.

Canonbury, June 19th, 1892.

"SAVED BY FIRE"—ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ.

SIR,—I hope you will permit me to make several replies at once.

I thank Mr. Brownlow Maitland for his letter on the true meaning of the biblical account of the Creation, which you publish in the PULPIT of the 18th. This, and Dean Chadwick's exposition of the same, as set forth in my letter in the same number, appear to clear away all difficulty.

A friend, whose opinion on such a subject I value, tells me that my letter in the same PULPIT on the words "saved so as through fire" is, in its latter part, untelligible from brevity, I therefore request leave to state my idea more fully.

In one of the best known parables of our Lord, a rich man made trial of the fidelity and competence of his servants by entrusting to them "talents" of money to be used for his benefit, and on his calling them to an account, those who had increased the money so entrusted were praised and rewarded; while the one who had let his talent remain idle, and returned it without any increase, was censured as "wicked and slothful."

This is to some extent a parallel passage to 1 Cor. iii. 11—15, which I will quote at length.

"Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ, but if any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; each man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide which he hath built thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as through fire."

Only two kinds of structure are here meant: a marble palace, adorned with gold and silver, and a wooden shed, thatched with straw or hay. The fire tests both; the one is preserved, the other is destroyed. The builder of the former receives his reward, the builder of the latter loses his labour and its reward, but is himself saved through the fire, because he built on Christ as his foundation.

It is obvious that the builder who receives a reward because his work abides is identical with the servants who receive a reward because they have increased their lord's money by trading. But the builder who is saved through the fire when his work is destroyed is not represented in Christ's parable; he is saved, and the slothful servant is condemned. His case is that of a servant receiving a talent, who endeavours to do the best for his lord, but fails, and loses the talent through errors of judgment, or, perhaps, want of vigilance. If St. Paul spoke the exact mind of Christ—which I think certain—a comparison of these two parables shows that our Lord will be much more severe on a servant who is "unprofitable" through sloth, than on one who is so through any reason implying less moral guilt, and especially that He will have no regard to the plea of those who think it enough to endeavour to "save their own souls," without doing anything more for God or man.

I have carefully read the "communicated" article in the PULPIT of the 18th, on the best way of representin English the word ψυχικός, and I think your contributor has made the difficulty for himself. The four passages in the New Testament where it occurs are the following:—

"The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. ii. 14).

"It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body. . . . . Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural: and afterward that which is spiritual" (1 Cor. xv. 44, 46).

"These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit" (Jude, 19).

"This wisdom is not a wisdom that cometh down from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish" (James iii. 15).

It appears to me that where St. Paul uses the word, "natural" gives his meaning exactly. In the others I would suggest "unspiritual." "Sensual" is quite right in St. Jude; but in St. James the expression "sensual wisdom" is almost self-contradictory. Should these suggestions be adopted in any future revision, the words in Jude would read, "unspiritual, having not the Spirit;" but the apparent tautology might be avoided by writing, "unspiritual, having not the spirit *of God*." It is certainly a mistake of your contributor to say that "ψυχικός has no moral implication whatever." I do not think it has any in St. Paul's use of the word; but it certainly has in the other two cases. The proposal to give up the attempt to translate it, and to naturalise it as "psychical," seems to me most unhappy. It would be totally unintelligible to merely

English readers, and the words which our translators have chosen to represent it are not misleading.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 19th June, 1892.

PREBENDARY BASSETT'S SERMON.

SIR,—I have been amused by the letters which it seems my sermon has called forth. The only connection between the letters and the sermon, it strikes me, is the heading, which may be the addition of the editor or the printer. Each one of your correspondents has given his opinion upon the problem, which, I have no doubt, is very gratifying to your readers, but they do not touch the points of the sermon in the least. The two main points were these: It had been asserted that between the present results of science and the statements of the Mosaic narrative there was an invincible antagonism. In the first place, therefore, I put down side by side the edicts of science and the bare text of the Bible, and asked the question whether there was not rather agreement than hostility. Secondly, reference was made to the statement that Light was created before the Sun. This seeming impossibility was confronted with the theory of Kant and Laplace, who were no friends of Revelation, which, at all events, supports rather than opposes the Biblical account, and has met with a large acceptance. There was no personal opinion offered on these points, which would have had no weight. The two antagonists were simply brought to face one another, apparently to shake hands. None of your correspondents has ventured to charge me either with misstating the verdicts of science, or with misquoting the Holy Scripture. What their remarks have to do with the sermon I fail to see, except that they refer to a common subject, though not to my treatment of it. Personal opinions are always pleasant to the proprietor, and sometimes edifying to others, but in mysterious questions of this kind *facts* only are of real value or validity.

F. TILNEY BASSETT,

Dulverton Vicarage, June 20th, 1892.

THE Ripon Diocesan Church Building and Extension Society has received £100 from Mr. H. E. Butler, of Nidd Hall.

THE Bishop of London has decided to postpone the election of the members of the London Diocesan Conference till November next.

THE Bishop of London will hold his third service for the admission of diocesan readers at St. Paul's Cathedral on Tuesday, July 12th, immediately after evensong.

THE Queen has approved the appointment of Mr. Charles Algernon Whitmore, M.P. for Chelsea, to be the Second Church Estates Commissioner, in the room of the Right Hon. Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, resigned.

BY means of a sustentation fund recently established, the Bishop of Liverpool has been enabled to raise the stipends of sixteen incumbents in poor parishes with more than 5,000 inhabitants to £235 for this year, and of seven incumbents of parishes with less than 5,000 inhabitants to £200.

THE arrangements for holding the Church Congress at Folkestone are, it is announced, in a forward state. A large building, to hold three thousand persons, will be erected in the Exhibition grounds, and sectional meetings will be held inside the Exhibition. The subjects for discussion have been selected, and a large number of well-known speakers have promised to address the Congress.

THE St. David's Diocesan Conference is to meet at Carmarthen on Thursday and Friday, October 20th and 21st. The following are the subjects for discussion:—(1) Confederation or Association of Church Sunday Schools; (2) the Spiritual and Social Advantages of a Resident Pastorate; (3) Pauperism and National Insurance; and (4) How to Promote the Better Observance of Sunday.

THE Rev. J. H. Overton, M.A. (Oxon), D.D. (Edin.), rector of Epworth and canon of Lincoln, joint author with the Rev. C. J. Abbey of "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century," and author of other valuable works, in reply to a requisition largely and influentially signed, has consented to allow himself to be put in nomination for the proctorship which will be vacant through the resignation of Canon Perry, rector of Waddington.

IN the diocese of Bangor three candidates have already signified their intention of seeking the suffrages of the clergy at the forthcoming election of Proctors, viz., Canon Trevor, rector of Machynlleth, the Rev. Richard Jones, rector of Llandyfrydog, and the Rev. David Jones, rector of Llanenddwyn. The present proctors are not going to seek re-election. For the representation of the Dean and Chapter the contest will lie between Canon D. W. Thomas (at present Proctor for the diocese) and Canon Eleazar Williams.

ON the dissolution of the present Lower House of the province of Canterbury, the Bishop of Coventry (Dr. Bowlby) has intimated his desire to retire from the representation of the diocese of Worcester. Canon Waller, rector of Little Packington, Coventry, will be a candidate for the vacant seat, and as he will receive very general support from the clergy of both archdeaconries (Worcester and Coventry), it is not improbable that he will be returned along with Canon W. W. Douglas as representative of the diocese in the new House of Convocation.

THE fifteenth annual meeting in connection with the diocese of New Westminster, British Columbia, will be held on Tuesday next, when there will be a public meeting at St. James's Hall, Piccadilly. The chair will be taken by Mr. J. A. Shaw Stewart, and among the speakers will be the Marquis of Lorne, the Archdeacon of Columbia, the Rev. A. A. Boddy, the Rev. E. McClure, and the following priests from the diocese:—Rev J. C. C. Kemm, Rev. Henry Edwardes, Rev. E. L Wright. Afterwards evensong will be held at All Saints', Margaret-street, when the Rev. Father Hall, S.S.J.E., will preach. On June 29th there will be a celebration of the Holy Communion at All Saints', Margaret-street, and in a large number of churches throughout the country. There will also be a choral celebration at 11 o'clock a.m. at All Saints', and the offertories at All Saints' and most of the other churches will be given to the Mission.

AT a court of assistants of the Sons of the Clergy, held on the 14th inst., at the Corporation House, Bloomsbury-place, Mr. J. Derby Allcroft, treasurer, in the chair, the registrar, Sir Paget Bowman, presented an unusually large number of applications from clergymen, both beneficed and unbeneficed, for assistance. Of the 138 applicants, ninety-six were over fifty years of age; the governors discouraging appeals from young clergymen, especially from that far too numerous class of men who have incurred the responsi-

bilities of marriage upon the slender stipend of a curate unbacked by private means. Due weight is given to the confidential advice of the Bishop or Archdeacon upon the merits of each case, and encouragement is frequently given to thrift by the grant being made directly toward the payment of the premium of life policies. The amount of the grants was £2,665.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adolphus, Rev. Horace, O.A., late Curate of St. Crispin's, Bermondsey; Assistant Priest of St. Stephen's, Haggerston.
Askwith, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Hereford; Vicar of St. Paul's, Canonbury.
Aston, Rev. Edward Albert Henry, M.A., Vicar of Fyfield, Abingdon; Rector of Codford St. Mary, Wilts.
Bennett, Rev. Hugh Frederic, Assistant-Master at Oswestry Grammar-school; Rector of Pirton-with-Croome d'Abitot, Worcester.
Bidder, Rev. H. J., B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Vicar; Afternoon Lecturer of St. Giles's, Oxford.
Bowers, Rev. W. H., M A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Barnabas', Gillingham, Kent.
Daintree, Rev. A.; Incumbent of Mowbray Church, Cape Town, South Africa.
Dandridge, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A.; Vicar of Soulbury, Bucks.
Dandridge, Rev. George, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Catherine's, Ventnor; Vicar of St. Mark's, Portsea.
Dunlop, Rev. Henry Robert, Rector of Buttermere, Cumberland.
Durnford, Rev. R. P.; Diocesan Organising Secretary for the Church Army in the Diocese of St. Albans, and North and East London (such Subdioceses as are within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Bedford).
Edmondson, Rev. Robert H., Curate-in-Charge of Old Swinford, near Stourbridge; Vicar of Cradley, Staffordshire.
Hilton, Rev. Alfred Giles, M.A.; Rector of Meyseyhampton, Gloucestershire.
Hindley, Rev. William Talbot, M.A., Vicar of St. Barnabas', Islington; Vicar of Meads (St. John's), Eastbourne.
Hodgson, Rev. John, Curate of Workington; Vicar of Nether Wasdale, Carnforth.
Hodson, Rev. H. E., M.A.; Vicar of the Lea, Gloucestershire.
Holmes, Rev. Bernard, E., M.A., late Priest-in-Charge of St. Saviour's, Clapham-common; Rector of King William's Town, Cape Colony.
James, Rev. J. A., M.A.; Rector of Dodington, Gloucestershire.
Lias, Rev. John James, M.A.; Rector of East Bergholt, Suffolk.
Lidbetter, Rev. S., Vicar of St. Mark's, Portsea; Vicar of Ramsdale, Hants.
Malet, Rev. Clement Drake Elton; Vicar of St. Mary-the-Virgin, Beech-hill, Berks.
Moore, Rev. R., B.A., T.C.D., late Curate of St. John's, Fulham; Vicar of St. Mary's, Birmingham.
Nuttall, Rev. E. A., late Curate of Burton-on-Trent; Organising Secretary for the North of England for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
Park, Rev. P. L., M.A.; Vicar of Highnam, Gloucestershire.
Pickering, Rev. A. M.; Minister of All Saints', South Wimbledon.
Sanderson, Rev. H. E., M.A., Head Master of King Edward's School, Bath; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Somerset.
Stamer, Right Rev. Sir Lovelace Tomlinson, D.D., Bart., Bishop-Suffragan of Shrewsbury and Rector of Stoke; Vicar of St. Chad's, Shrewsbury.
Wood, Rev. John, Curate; Incumbent of Highfield, Pemberton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allfree, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of St. Swithin-with-St.-Mary-Bothaw, in the City of London, at 62, Myddelton-square, on the 17th inst., aged 85.
Balfour, Rev. William, M.A., late Vicar of Minsterworth, Gloucestershire, suddenly, Rockdene, Weston-super-Mare, on the 13th inst., aged 74.
Holmes, Rev. Alleyne James, Rector of Egdean, at Berton Firs, Pworetth, on the 12th inst., aged 63.

HEALTH WITHOUT PHYSIC.

PEOPLE frequently wonder how it is that by wearing Harness' Electropathic Belt disease may be speedily and effectually exterminated from the system. The fact is that the majority of suffering men and women have, from their very childhood, been accustomed to fly to nauseous drugs and quack medicines, in the hope of obtaining relief whenever they are unwell, and we can easily understand that they are now inclined to doubt the efficacy of so convenient and simple an appliance as this genuine Electric Belt. Let such people once take the trouble to inquire into the matter for themselves, and either call or write, and have its action fully explained to them, and they will no longer be sceptical. The Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W., are the sole proprietors and manufacturers of Harness' Electropathic Appliances, and all in search of health are cordially invited to call if possible and personally inspect the originals or copies of the thousands of unsolicited testimonials they have received. We do not think that those who act on this advice will have any doubt afterwards regarding the positive healing influences of mild continuous currents of electricity, such as are imperceptibly generated by wearing one of Harness' Electropathic Belts. These curative appliances are light and comfortable in wear, and the practical and scientific evidence we have of their remarkable curative efficacy is quite indisputable. The company's consulting officers are only too anxious at all times to answer any questions on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, and we sincerely trust that their efforts to provide suffering humanity with perfect appliances as aids to health and the most approved methods of electrical treatment may be amply rewarded in the future as it has been in the past, and that the thousands of pounds they spend annually in advertising may be the means of preventing the intrusion and fraudulent dealings of pirates and vendors of the most useless bogus toy appliances and bring Harness' genuine Electropathic Belts under the notice of every suffering man and woman in the kingdom. We may add that the ailments that have been cured already by Mr. Harness' electropathic treatment can be cured again in the same way, and the more obstinate the disease the more anxious the company's officers are to prove the marked supremacy of electricity over medicine or any other form of treatment. Let all those who reside at a distance, or are otherwise unable to call and avail themselves of a free personal consultation, cut this notice out, and write without delay for descriptive illustrated pamphlet and book of testimonials. The latter contains copies or hundreds of letters received from all parts of the country, and from all classes of society, whom they have either relieved or completely cured of various nervous, muscular, and organic affections, including the following:—

Nervous Exhaustion, Physical Debility, Neuralgia, Sleeplessness, Brain Fag, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Melancholia, Paralysis, St. Vitus' Dance, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Defective Circulation, Poorness of Blood, Indigestion, Diarrhœa, Liver Complaints, Flatulence, Constipation, Kidney Disorders, Ladies' Ailments, Internal Weakness, Tropical Diseases, Impaired Vitality, Pains in the Back, Weak and Languid Feelings, Chest Complaints, etc.

We wish to impress upon our readers that the Medical Battery Company's only address is the Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W. (at the corner of Rathbone Place), and that during the many years they have been established in London they have succeeded in making their palatial premises the largest and only complete Electro-therapeutic Institute in the world.

All communications are regarded as strictly private and confidential, and should be addressed to Mr. C. B. Harness, President of the Medical Battery Company (Limited), 52, Oxford Street, London, W.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 028229182